

# THE CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

No. CCX.]

JUNE, 1862.

[VOL. XVIII.]

## THE CHURCH THAT MIGHT BE NATIONAL.\*

Church al-  
leged to be  
helpless.

It is not by any means clear to some such persons, by what power the Church *could* be reformed, if the needful alterations were agreed upon. "The Church of England," says Dr. Vaughan, "has practically lost its machinery for self-modification. To deal conclusively with questions of doctrine or even of ritual, Convocation has no power and Parliament little fitness. The one represents but a part of the Church—but a part even of the clergy—even of the clergy of one province; the other includes many who are not of the Church at all. If the demand for change could be made as precise as it is now vague, and as harmonious as it is now discordant, there would still remain the questions, to whom is it to be addressed? and where resides, if not the power, yet the right, to grant it or to refuse." (*Revision of the Liturgy*, Introd. pp. ix, x.)

Was ever such a confession of helplessness! The National Church of England has no power of self-adjustment to the nation's requirements! Then it is high time that the nation should look after their own affairs.

Parliament

We hold as Englishmen that Parliament has the can reform it. indisputable power and right (which Convocation happily has not) to deal with the English Church as Parliament may think proper. Parliament has done this several times already, and can do it again as often as may be necessary. There is no fear of its being done needlessly often, judging by the perpetual evasion or postponement of the work for the last ninety years. We know not why the unfitness of Parliament for re-arranging the basis of a National Church should be assumed on account of its including many who do not worship with the existing sectarian Church. As they are shut out by its want of nationality, they are the very persons to be consulted how to make it national. For *National* is the word that describes its professed aim and duty, and its claim to respect and support.

The alterna-  
tive: Lax  
Subscription  
and Non-na-  
tural Sense.

But what is the alternative recommended by those who think the Church so helpless and hopeless of amendment? It is truly saddening to the natural conscience of what is right and straightforward, to read such suggestions as the following from the pen

\* Continued from p. 296.

of an eminent scholar and divine, who, if report spoke truly a few years ago, might now have been upon the Bench of Bishops to assist or retard the required legislation. In the Introduction to his Five Discourses on Revision of the Liturgy (which might have been more descriptively intitled, "Discourses *against* Revision"), Dr. Vaughan says, "The difficulties of revision are made more apparent, and its advantages more problematical, by every discussion." "What is needed for the comfort of the scrupulous" (and "in themselves," he says, "scruples are a weakness, are an evil, are a disease") "is rather construction than change; rather interpretation than alteration; the authoritative assurance that there is no dishonesty in their position, rather than such an adjustment of that position as, in accommodating them, must exclude others." He claims it as "no small blessing, in the eyes of all but party theologians, that there should be room within the pale of a common worship for men of various opinions." He speaks of the Articles and Formularies as "drawn from various sources, and incapable perhaps in some points of a perfectly logical coherence;" and adds, "It is thus that excellent men of conflicting doctrinal notions on many topics of secondary and on some of primary importance, have been enabled to worship together, and even to minister together, in a common Church and at a common altar." He distinguishes between *compromise* and *comprehension*. By the former he means "vagueness of expression, the omission of all that is distinctive and pointed, and such a softening and lowering of the tone of doctrine as should make it equally agreeable to the Calvinist and the Arminian, to the Romanist and the Socinian." *Comprehension* he would find in "the interpretation of that position which a minister, and even a worshiper, in the Church of England occupies as such." How then would he interpret?

He would have it "not timidly whispered but boldly said" by the Bishop to the candidate for ordination: "In declaring your acceptance of the Book of Common Prayer, you do not profess that there is nothing in that book which you might yourself have been glad to express somewhat differently. . . . It is enough to justify your place amongst the ministers of a National Church, if you can say from the heart that, of the various Christian communities known to you in this country, this is the one which most commends itself to your judgment and conscience; that it is the Church of your choice and of your affection; that you are able with confidence and comfort to worship in its words, to minister in its offices, and to teach in its spirit."

"Emphasis of Subscription made by an incumbent on institution to a benefice, enfeebles it." of his "unfeigned assent and consent to all and everything contained and prescribed in and by the Book of Common



Prayer, as well as to the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion," Dr. Vaughan actually says: "No doubt the language of the last (more particularly) of these three declarations is needlessly stringent. *Its very emphasis enfeebls it.* Common sense puts upon its terms a construction which alone makes them tolerable, but which at the same time leaves *little save the promise to conform*, and the certainty that no honest man will promise conformity to that with which he does not *in the main sympathize*." He is willing, indeed, to see "the terms of subscription" altered, but not on any account the Prayer Book itself altered; and he thinks the "bold assertion and candid recognition of the practical meaning of any such forms of declaration" will do instead of their alteration.

Consistently with these extracts from the Introduction, the Discourses themselves undertake to justify the retention of everything that has been so repeatedly objected to in the *Absolution*, the Church doctrine of *Regeneration*, the *Athanasian Creed*, the *Burial Service*, and the Service for *Holy Orders*. The justification is attempted by *explaining away* all objectionable expressions as "enfeebled by their very emphasis."

The alternative is thus plainly stated to lie between *revision and reform* on the one hand, and *lax subscription and interpretation* on the other. And the latter is the course recommended.

Nowhere in the writings of Broad Churchmen or politicians is this mode of evading the difficulty more unblushingly avowed. Essayists and Reviewers imply it and act upon it, but Dr. Vaughan explains and vindicates it. We have therefore quoted him so fully.

Question lies between obsolete Formularies and nice Morality.

Is not the alternative as expressed by him equivalent to saying, that the question lies between antiquated Church formularies and nice morality? One or the other must be sacrificed. Most deeply is it to be regretted that the manifest difficulties which

beset the question of Church reform should drive able and high-minded men into reasonings which, if the question were any but a Church question, would at once be condemned as sophistical or evasive. The moral aspects of this matter are very serious indeed.

Casuistry of Theologians.

The fact is as notorious as it is shameful, that on no other subject have so many laboured pleas for laxity in regard to promises, vows, oaths or engagements been put forth, as where religious beliefs are concerned. The subtleties of lawyers are as nothing to the casuistries of subscribing theologians. The world of business would shun a man as dishonest who paltered thus with a double sense. Mr. Macnaught has rightly said, that if the same laxity were used in mercantile contracts which prevails in regard to the Church Articles, there would soon be an end of faith between man and man. If "the emphasis of a declaration enfeebls it," as Dr. Vaughan declares, then an oath

in a court of justice may be broken because it is more emphatic than a simple word. But the secular world has never admitted such jesuitry. It would be ashamed to say that articles of partnership, or a lease or conveyance of property, was enfeebled by the emphasis of legal phraseology and signature. But with subscription to Church Articles, it seems, we may play fast and loose, insisting upon their retention as necessary to the Church, to morals, to piety, to Christianity itself; and then pleading for laxity in interpreting both their meaning and the import of our own act of signing them. Are those Articles so sacred that they must not be touched, yet so meaningless that they may be slighted? And does the Church make no account of the morals of subscription and the morals of belief? Are perfect sincerity and simplicity to be dispensed with in religion, at the fountain-head of thought and life? A systematized insincerity is more corrupting than a passionate sin repented of.

Advocates of Lax Conformity. From Paley downwards (who "could not afford to keep a conscience"), the defenders of lax conformity have put into plausible words the thought on which lax conformists had already acted in signing Articles without believing them,—namely, that to require "the actual belief of each and every proposition contained in them" is equivalent to supposing "that the Legislature expected the consent of ten thousand men, and that in perpetual succession, not to one controverted proposition, but to many hundreds." And Paley adds: "It is difficult to conceive how this could be expected by any who observed the incurable diversity of human opinion upon all subjects short of demonstration." Yet the obvious rejoinder is, They *did* require it, and therefore seem to have *thought it possible*. They certainly made a law, which has ever since been enforced, that the ten thousand men must *say* they fulfil the impossible conditions. In fact, men in those times did think it both possible and necessary. They did *not* observe the incurable diversity of human opinion, or they thought it *curable* and *resolved to cure it*. They did *not* carefully distinguish between demonstrable and probable beliefs, or they thought the proofs of the subjects concerned to be *as absolute as demonstration*. It is hardly fair to maintain that articles of agreement were written in order that men might freely differ respecting them, and that the emphasis of the demand for uniform belief was meant to enfeeble it.

Uniformity was once thought possible. The plain historical fact is, that the Legislature of those days, guided by the Churchmen, thought uniformity of belief both necessary and possible. Neither Churchmen nor Statesmen recognized the fundamental rights and duties of the individual mind. The theologians of the day stoutly proclaimed the necessity and sufficiency of a true belief to salvation, and confided in their own



faculty of defining unerringly what that true and safe belief was. And the real question for us of the present day is, whether it is right to retain and sign and vindicate those same Articles on the very ground that we have discovered their fundamental principle to be erroneous,—that many of their doctrinal statements are to us untrue and the accompanying requirements absurd,—that, in short, we accept neither the Articles nor their alleged awful sanction. Who shall give the “authoritative assurance” suggested, “that there is no dishonesty in such a position”? The “authoritative assurance” of the whole Bench of Bishops or both Houses of Convocation would but shew that the morality of the Church was less scrupulous than that of the shop and counting-house.

True conclusion from discovered mistake. Surely the more natural and honest conclusion would be, that the mistaken basis adopted three hundred years ago ought to be exchanged for a truer one now that the mistake is discovered; that uniform belief being now known to be impossible in point of fact, it should no longer be attempted in appearance; that the blessing of having “room within the pale of a common worship for men of various opinions on matters even of primary importance,” should appear on the face of the constitution of the Church; that subscription to Articles should cease, and the presumptuous dogma of salvation by orthodox opinions be no more officially spoken. This would be true *comprehension*; and here would be no *compromise*, unless it be compromise to relinquish the asserted right of thinking for others.

The Question for to-day. To effect such a change in the constitution of the Church of England would, no doubt, be a work of difficulty and a work of time. But sooner or later (and apparently the time cannot be very far off) the difficulty must be faced. If the clerical conscience can reconcile itself to the “science of insincerity,” the lay conscience cannot. Pity that the efforts which might possibly bring health and freedom, should be devoted to the vain task of teaching a *non-natural* meaning for plain but mistaken words!

Lax Subscription out of the question. Rejecting, therefore, the expedient of lax subscription and interpretation, as neither honourable in itself nor a possible solution of the acknowledged difficulty, let us consider such suggestions as have been made for the reform of the Church of England.

Reform of Articles and Liturgy? One proposal is, to revise the Articles and Liturgy. The practical difficulties that beset this method seem to defy all hope of success. The diversities of theological opinion confessedly existing among the clergy, and others unconfessed which must be presumed to exist, render it impossible. The few suggested schemes of revision are so cautious, and their proposed alterations so few, as scarcely to

touch the great diversities of national opinion outside the existing Church. To omit or modify the Absolution of the Sick, to strike out the much debated passages implying Baptismal Regeneration, the anathemas of the Athanasian Creed (or even the Creed itself), the too "sure and certain hope" expressed in the Burial Service, and the assumption by the Bishop of power to communicate the Holy Ghost to the candidate for holy orders, is perhaps the extreme of expurgation that has been proposed by any clerical advocates of revision. But even this would be strenuously resisted by the High-Church party, and, if effected, would do little to conciliate the wider beliefs of educated and thoughtful men both within and without the Church. To agree upon the revision of the doctrinal and metaphysical Articles would be utterly impossible; and if (for argument's sake) we suppose it was agreed upon, the Articles in their new form would only settle matters for a while, because the thing really required is not a minute statement of what all believe, but provision for freedom and diversity.

**Relief from Subscription?** Another plan would be that which was proposed by the 250 petitioners to Parliament in 1771, chiefly clergymen, with Archdeacon Blackburne at their head, and some eminent laymen assisting, who desired that a declaration of assent to the sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures might be substituted in lieu of subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles and the Book of Common Prayer. Had this prayer been granted, the Church of England would have been put into pretty much the same position as the Church of Geneva. It was of course rejected; and since that time (strange to say) no attempt of the kind has been repeated. It is not because the need is less; for the diversities of human belief are become greater through the greater activity of thought and more comprehensive range of scientific inquiry. But the dread of change, the fear of heresy, and the policy of delay which then prevailed, have prevailed ever since; and hopelessness of relief has taught a convenient laxness of interpretation.

**Repeal of Act of Uniformity.** The most thorough reform would be, the repeal of the Act of Uniformity. And perhaps, all things considered, it is as much within reasonable prospect as any other scheme. For a moment let it be supposed done; and what would be its results?

**How it would work.** It would leave the question of subscription or no subscription to articles to be settled, from time to time and from place to place, between the respective patrons, parishes or congregations and their clergy. It would give the clergyman power (unless restrained by those who appoint him) to omit or modify various obsolete or objectionable phrases, to his own great relief and that of his congregation. It would leave the revision of the Liturgy open to any who chose to attempt it,



and would put it within the choice of each congregation to select one or other of the many revisions which would probably soon make their appearance, or even to adopt free prayer instead if they and their clergyman please.

Gradual  
changes.

Certainly this would be a sweeping change in the constitution of the Church of England. But the alterations in its practice would be very gradual and gentle. The love of change is not a prominent impulse in matters relating to religious worship. Quite the contrary. Even among Dissenters the habits of the olden time long resist all needless changes, and sometimes try the patience of the advocates of what seems natural progress. If the Established Church were thus set free from its legal bond of uniformity, the immediate result would be to enable clergymen to satisfy their own scruples by the omission of those few things in the Liturgy which grate even upon orthodox minds. Few persons would find fault with the omission of the Athanasian curses, or the exaggerated confession that "there is no health in us." Few clergymen would be called to account by public opinion for burying the unbaptized. A Maurice, who comes to think scripturally and reasonably about the term *everlasting* or *eternal*, would be in little danger of losing a Professorship on that account. A Robertson, in perfect sympathy with his congregation in their pursuit of scriptural inquiry and practical religion, would not have to sustain the odium of heresy. A Macnaught, while ministering to the religious intelligence of men who would fain bring the same open minds and hearts to God in worship that they bring to their worldly business, would not feel that he could serve them only during the sufferance of the law. A simple-hearted mystic like Mr. Heath might utter obscure or doubtful theories of scripture doctrine and prophecy for the edification of his country parishioners, without being lionized in the Court of Arches. And real scholars like Jowett and Rowland Williams would escape both the persecution and prosecution which are the present scandal of a University and an Episcopate.

Opposition to  
be expected. No doubt the proposal to repeal the Act of Uniformity would excite a loud burst of theological indignation. "To what endless diversities of doctrine are you opening the way!" "You will have heresy in the same Church with orthodoxy!" "What concord hath Christ with Belial? or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel?" would be asked with presumptuous parody upon St. Paul's reprobation of Corinthian idolatry and vice. "The Church," it would be said, ought to preserve the true and orthodox doctrine. To which the reply is obvious: The Church does not at present, and cannot do, any such thing. It has tried all these centuries to do it, and tried in vain, devoting more zeal to doctrine than to practice. Endless diversities of belief *do* exist among those of its clergy

who study and think. What is called orthodoxy and what is called heresy now exist side by side within its pale, and the Church is impotent to prevent what her theory condemns. Instead of upholding an irrational and impossible standard, it will be better to recognize the facts of human nature and provide for their free and honest development. Let the Church of England openly avow and defend the rights of the mind, and accept the divinely-ordained diversities of human belief as its genuine, healthy and virtuous growths. The Church will then be truly National.

No wrong to any one. Nor could any one say that he was individually wronged by being thus put in possession of freedom, though he might complain if the Articles of subscription were changed for others. Not the most orthodox or the most bigoted could pretend that he was damaged or persecuted by the step suggested. He would still be just where he is and as he is, unless he choose to move; for he would be free to do as his own conscience might next direct him. No one's belief would be interfered with; only the power of interfering with the belief of others would be taken away. But while the monopoly of orthodoxy was thrown open, vested interests would be untouched. No one would be aggrieved, unless it be a grievance to lose the power of calling another heretic.

Freedom for all. In this respect the proposal to repeal the Act of Uniformity has a great advantage over that of revising the Articles and Liturgy. A revised Liturgy and Articles would still offend against the conscientious beliefs of many. It would still leave the national mind and conscience bound. But the repeal of the Act of Uniformity would be our simple acceptance of that diversity of beliefs which is manifestly ordained by Him who formed the human mind. Freedom for all is injury to none.

Is the repeal possible? Still the question recurs, Is the possibility of such a reform in the constitution of the Church of England conceivable?

Without disguising its difficulties, we believe it to be more within rational expectation than any other. And we believe it would be, in its very nature, final and satisfactory; and that no other would be so.

Depends on its promoters. On the question of practicability, all depends upon the agents to whom we look for reform.

A doctrinal reconstruction of the Articles and Liturgy would be naturally supposed to devolve upon the clergy, who, as already observed, could never heartily agree as to what constitutes orthodox doctrine, or could only do so in appearance and through temporary compromise. All Dr. Vaughan's objections are valid here. But the repeal of the Act of Uniformity is the proper work and duty of laymen, equally with scholarly and philosophi-



cal clergymen, who, by repealing it, would not pretend to decide a single theological question, but would simply leave all such questions open to discussion.

**The Clergy** It is scarcely to be expected that the clergy in  
**less likely** general should take the lead in this or any other  
**than the Laity.** demand for reform. The invidious names of Orthodoxy and Heresy forbid the idea. To advocate the repeal of the restraining statute would be taken as an avowal of heretical theology. The laity, whenever they shall become sufficiently interested in the subject, will feel no such grounds of hesitation. They will have no scruple in setting their clergy free, even against their will; though they might not presume to decide questions of orthodox belief. They will feel themselves competent to knock off the fetters of three hundred years ago, and to leave thought free henceforth. To lay action we must therefore chiefly look, though not exclusively.

**Liberal** If the actual state of things has now been described  
**Churchmen** with something of the fairness attempted;—if its  
**and Dissent-** continuance involves a more and more lax conformity  
**ers.** ity to unbelieved opinions, and is fast reducing insincerity to a system and a science, and making the secular world cry shame upon the Church;—if the idea of uniformity is radically unsound and impracticable;—if the revision of the Articles and Liturgy is hopeless through theological diversities, and would, if effected, be still a bone of contention and a bar to free thought;—if the mere repeal of the enactment which so insultingly demands uniformity would make free thought and sincerity legal within the Church of England;—and if this remedy can only be applied through the vigorous and resolute exertions of the laity (that is, of the nation) to make the Church national in something more than name;—we may perhaps find the answer ready to those immediately practical questions, whether free-minded Dissenters would promote this end by coming into the Church, or free-minded Churchmen by going out of it? If a few words of obvious deduction do not point the answer, no laboured argument or exhortation will.

**Liberal Dis-** As to the free-minded Dissenter going into the  
**senters must** Church in hope of reforming it,—there can be little  
**not conform.** hesitation in answering, that such a step on his part would be simply to give up his vantage ground. As an Englishman, he has the same right as any Churchman to think, to act and to legislate for the government of that national institution and the distribution of that national property, the Church. He would therefore gain nothing in political power or position by conforming. But by conforming he would give up his moral power and position. He would renounce his strong individuality and visible freedom. Worst of all, he would forfeit his personal claim for reform by having adopted the personal expedient of

lax conformity. He need not ask to have the door opened when he has already picked the lock. He has compromised his own opinions and given his sanction to that false morality respecting belief and unbelief which is eating the heart of sincerity out of us.

Must Liberal Churchmen dissent? It is less easy to give a peremptory answer to the question, whether the Churchman who is too liberal-minded for the Church as it is, must come out of it in order to reform it. We cannot forget the power of young habit and venerated associations, nor expect that all the united faculties of the soul will follow the first call of the opinionative reason. Even among our numberless Dissenting sects, the Churchman who is dissatisfied with his Church through love of free thought, might in many localities be at a loss to know where to find the freedom, and yet more the culture, which he seeks. But while still frequenting the established service, he must feel that "unbelieved words thrust by legislative authority upon the hour of worship" are a perpetual damage to the soul's sincerity, and that the habit of "mental reserve" is inconsistent with earnest devotion or truthful character. And, judging by all parallel cases of reforms long delayed if gained at length, we must believe that the silence and passiveness of the laity, and their tendency to become indifferent through not actively remonstrating against those things in the Church Service which offend their belief or feeling, is the real cause of the non-reformation of the Church. *Quieta non movere* is always the rule with the passive adherents of legalized forms and institutions. But when things are actively in motion for reform, the hint is seldom lost upon the ruling powers.

Difference between Clergy and Laity. As to the duty of secession from the Church when its doctrines no longer express one's own belief, there is an evident difference of degree (but only of degree) between the case of the clergyman and that of the layman. The former has solemnly subscribed his assent to the formularies of the Church, and is bound to use them without variation or omission. He has entered into engagements which forbid either change of belief or a free exercise of theological thought. As a clergyman, he is bound to believe all the Creeds and Articles of the Church, and the implied doctrines of its offices, in the legal (which is usually the natural) sense of the words. Common morality requires this. And when he no longer conscientiously does what he has solemnly undertaken to do, common morality says he ought to resign. It is for every man's own conscience to decide whether he will accept the guidance of common morality or the casuistical distinctions of writers in behalf of subscription to unbelieved Articles.

The layman, on the other hand, has not signed the Articles, and is not their official representative and exponent; and he may perhaps bear to hear what grates upon his convictions a



little longer than a clergyman ought actively to repeat and vouch for it. This difference is clear. But it is a difference of degree, not of principle. And the change, when felt to be right, is much easier for the layman to make than for the clergyman, as it involves no sacrifice but that of habit and perhaps worldly *status*; whereas to the clergyman it may be the sacrifice of his children's bread, and must be the breaking up of his life's best purposes.

False analogy pleaded for Conformity. Apologetic conformity has somewhat violently strained a pretty simile by representing the Churchman as born to the Church, just as the Englishman is born to his country, and insisting that the act of dissent is parallel to emigration. It might indeed be well that the Church should reconstruct itself upon the wide national basis implied in this comparison. But, *with the Church as it is*, an Englishman is no more born to Churchmanship as an incident of his life than to a chancery suit, or the county jail, or the parish poor-house. All these are no doubt, in some sense, national institutions, and are parts of his national privileges or liabilities. But he only claims or incurs them according to circumstances. There are qualifying conditions in each instance to be fulfilled. He only claims his national position as a chancery suitor in case of legal necessity, or his parish allowance in case of poverty;—he only incurs the jail by right of crime. And he becomes a member of the Church (as at present constituted) only through expressed or implied belief in her complicated and exclusive creeds. They are the condition of his membership. It is therefore a false, or at least a strained, analogy which represents an Englishman as a Churchman by birth, and would have him dissent only as he would emigrate.

A truer sensitiveness to the *morals of belief*, we cannot but imagine, would lead multitudes of liberal-thinking clergymen, of that order from which victims are every now and then selected for episcopal censure or deprivation by ecclesiastical courts, to emigrate at once (if that be the parallel) to a freer shore. Their special pleadings about "allowing," "acknowledging" or "assenting to" the Articles, grate sadly on the freer, if not more sensitive, conscience. And, if the laity were as outspoken on State enactments respecting religious belief and worship, as they are on those which regulate commerce, taxation, criminal law and other secular matters, it is not to be believed that the Legislature could long turn a deaf ear to the demand for Church reform. Nor would the laity endure to see the Church called National shutting out from its pulpits and professorships the best minds of the nation, and falling into that miserable sectarianism which will be inevitably stamped upon it if its ministry shall come to be represented by men whose single qualification is their sincere

or well-feigned content to abide by the theological doctrines of Cranmer.

The Secular Press.

Already the secular press is asking with contemptuous impatience, in reference to the ecclesiastical prosecutions now in progress, whether it has ever occurred to the Bishops to consider the natural effect of such prosecutions, in deterring the best minds from entering the service of the Church, and leaving its ministry to "those who are unfit for any busier vocation, or those to whom a clergyman's position is a rise in life;" offering "an easy entrance to the stupid, optional work to the idle, a brevet of gentility to those who feel their need of it." Already the secular press decides that "a church which depended upon them alone would not hold its ground for two generations." "This is an age in which men bear every sort of rule impatiently; but the restraint at which they chafe the most is that which curbs free thought or speech. People may view the fact how they will—they may count it as praise or as blame to our generation—but fact it remains still, to be dealt with, not to be ignored." (*Saturday Review*, Nov. 23, 1861.)

Should not

blame the Bishops, but demand Reform.

The tone of other secular papers is similar. But we miss in such complaints the earnest purpose of men who would go to the root of the evil and place "free thought and speech" beyond the reach of episcopal censure. It is one thing to reproach the Bishops for using the ecclesiastical law according to the existing constitution of the Church; it would be a better and truer thing to demand the repeal of the law. It is one thing to invoke silence and compromise; it were a nobler thing to seek redress. The railery spent upon narrow-minded Bishops who are acting conscientiously and consistently under a narrow Church Establishment which the age has outgrown, should be turned into earnest resolution and effort to rectify those laws which give them such power and make such acts their duty. While the constitution of the Church remains as it is, the most consistent Bishops are the narrow and intolerant ones. Shall we hope to cure intolerance by invoking insincerity to protect us? Or shall we not rather call for the repeal of those laws which make intolerance possible and sorely tempt to insincerity?

Prosecutions and Secessions will necessitate Reform.

Long before the Church shall have lost all its best learning and talent through the slow but vexatious processes of the ecclesiastical courts, the righteous jealousy of Englishmen for the credit of their National Establishment will surely be roused into activity. Or the advent of needful reform may perhaps be hastened by the more decisive action of that class of minds whose free and scholarly habits constitute at present the chief difficulty, the chief danger and the chief discredit of the Church as it is.

If all who have already made themselves liable to ecclesiastical



law by the publication of free theological thought, and all others who would become liable if they made their beliefs equally public, could see it to be their duty to resign their benefices, the Church could not afford to lose them, and the nation assuredly *would not*. The Church could not exist for two generations under such destitution of talent and scholarship as she would then suffer. Reform would become a necessity palpable even to statesmen.

There was a day when, for infinitely fewer and less important diversities of religious opinion than 1662 and 1862. now prevail within the Church, Two Thousand of its noblest-hearted clergy left its communion. That was in 1662, when on St. Bartholomew's Day, the 24th of August (a day previously black with religious persecution in France), the treacherous Act of Uniformity came into operation, dispossessing the Puritan clergy and necessitating dissent thenceforth.

Will 1862 pass by without some attempt to repeal that cruel and irrational yet futile Act? Dissent has grown ever since that stern enactment of Uniformity; with its repeal the Church of England might at least deserve to become again National.

#### ARCHBISHOP WHATELY ON CHRISTIANITY.\*

Few persons who are acquainted with the writings of Archbishop Whately, will see an announcement of a new work by him without feeling a strong desire to peruse it, and a sanguine expectation of receiving from it both pleasure and instruction. The vigorous sense of the Archbishop, his clear and nervous style, and, to a great extent, his independent thought, entitle him to the respectful attention of his readers. With these and many other excellences, a reflecting reader can hardly fail to perceive errors in his works, arising apparently in part from a peculiarity of his own mind, and still more from his position in the world. That position is sure to command attention to his works; and many just and noble sentiments which might escape notice if they fell from the pen of one in the common walks of life, will, coming from one of the highest dignitaries of the Established Church, produce their full effect on his readers.

We have no intention to write a regular review of the author's work on Christianity; but we think that the attention of our readers may be called to some passages of the work which will well repay their attention, and which are calculated greatly to promote just and important views of religion, and to others to

\* Whately on the Rise, Progress and Corruptions of Christianity: a preliminary Treatise in the Encyclopædia Britannica.

which we are compelled to refuse our assent, and which appear to us quite unworthy of the eminent writer from whose pen they flow.

We will begin with the more agreeable part of our task :

“Any one who regards the Bible (as many Christians do) as *one book* containing Divine instructions, without having formed any clear notion of what does and does not belong to each dispensation, will of course fall into the greatest confusion of thought. He will be like a man who should have received from his father, at various times, a great number of letters, containing directions as to his conduct, from the time when he was a little child just able to read, till he was a grown man ; and who should lay by these letters with care and reverence, but in a confused heap, and should take up any one of them at random, and read it without any reference to its *date*, whenever he needed his father’s instruction how to act.”—Pp. 509, 510.

The sound sense of this passage, and its lively and striking language, require neither comment nor commendation.

The essay contains many just and well-expressed remarks against the *Judaizing* character of the High-church party (although he does not use that word), and states distinctly the difference between the duties of the Jewish and what he calls the Christian priest. The sentiments expressed are sound and excellent ; but why does the Archbishop use the word *priest* at all as the designation of a Christian teacher ? That word is never applied in the New Testament to those who exercised the office of instructors in the Christian church, and it was unwarrantably given to them in later times in lieu of the name elder or presbyter. We consider that the introduction of the word *priest* in this sense, has produced some of the most lamentable corruptions of the Christian religion. The business of a priest is to offer a sacrifice ; and in the progress of Church history arose the monstrous doctrine, that in the Lord’s Supper the priest offered a real sacrifice to the Almighty. The death of Christ may be called, in an important sense, a sacrifice ; but the doctrine that his death was a satisfaction to Divine justice, and that without such a sacrifice the Deity could not, consistently with his justice, pardon penitent sinners, robs the Father of all of the lovely attributes of mercy, and transfers the love of Him to the so-called Second Person of the Trinity, in spite of what was said by our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, who refused the title *good*, and declared that God alone is good.

In p. 517, we have the following passage :

“We are inclined to think, that if all Christians had always studied the Scriptures carefully and honestly, and relied on these more than on their own philosophical systems of divinity, the Incarnation, for instance, and the Trinity would never have been *doubted* nor even *named*.”

That these doctrines, under the circumstances assumed, would not have been *named*, we, who reject them, fully agree ; but it



is beyond our comprehension to understand how the truth of doctrines which had not even found a name, could have been fully admitted and never doubted; yet this must be the meaning of the author, who fills one of the highest stations in the united Church of England and Ireland, which holds and strongly enforces the truth of these doctrines.

We come now to the last quotation to which we shall call the attention of our readers. It occurs at pp. 485, 486, and has reference to John v. 18: "Therefore the Jews sought the more to kill him, because he not only had broken the Sabbath, but said also that God was his Father, making himself equal with God."

"It is worth remarking," says the Archbishop, "that they (the Jews) understood his calling himself the Son of God, and saying that God was his *own proper* Father, as a claim to be a Divine person. His words, indeed, might in themselves conceivably bear another meaning. But he must have *known* that *they* so understood him; and if they had mistaken his meaning, he would not have failed to correct their mistake, else he would have been bearing false testimony against himself."

Let us attend to what is said respecting this text by the very able and learned Dr. Samuel Clarke: "The Jews," he says, "'tis evident, did not by these expressions mean to charge Jesus with affirming himself to be the supreme, self-existent, independent Deity; nay, not so much as with taking upon himself to be a Divine Person at all, but only with assuming to himself the power and authority of God." He refers to John x. 33 and Mark ii. 7, as illustrations of the text. This explanation of the text seems to us satisfactory. We will now examine the grounds on which the Archbishop supports a very different interpretation. What he means his reader to understand by distinguishing the words "*own proper*," before the word Father, by the emphatic Italian type, we do not precisely understand. If it means only that Jesus was the Son of God in a higher sense than other men who are sometimes called the sons of God, we have no disposition to dispute it. In the very next verse Jesus clearly declares his absolute dependence on his Father; but in that and the following verses he claims power from God far beyond what had ever been given to any other person. The most exalted of the patriarchs and prophets would not have presumed to use such language as is found in those verses. Which of them would have dared to say (John xiv. 23), "If a man love me, he will keep my words: and the Father will love him, *and we will come unto him and make our abode with him*"? In this sense we have no objection to make to the Archbishop's language; but this we cannot understand to be his meaning. Bearing in mind that this essay is written by a Prelate of a Trinitarian Church, we cannot fail to perceive that by the words, "claim to be a Divine Person," the author must be understood to assert that Jesus

claimed to be God the Son, the Second Person in the Trinity. Now this requires a great deal to be proved which we feel confident that the Archbishop cannot prove. If the Jews understood our Saviour to declare himself to be the Second Person of the Trinity, they must have been aware that the doctrine of the Trinity had at some time or other been held by their nation, or at least had been taught among them. Now, in the whole of the Old Testament, from Genesis to Malachi, not a single word is to be found asserting a Trinity of Persons in the Godhead. Neither is the word Trinity found in the Old Testament, nor any words whatever having the like meaning. The doctrine of the Trinity is not held by the Jews of our own times, nor has it ever been held by their nation at any period of their history.

---

JOSEPH ALLEINE, ONE OF THE EJECTED CLERGYMEN OF 1662.\*

ON the 26th of May, 1663 (a Sabbath eve), Mr. Alleine was seized on a charge of having violated the Act of Uniformity. The justices and their associates before whom he was taken, reviled him with scurrilous phrases; and it is sad to read that even ladies disgraced their rank and sex by violent abuse. The unmoved countenance and serene expression of the prisoner seemed only to increase their wrath. Slight as the case against him was, the magistrates ordered his committal; but gave him a respite from prison till the following Monday. Watched too closely by the officers of the law on the following day, he could not preach; but he received many of his friends on that sorrowful day. When his enemies' vigilance was relaxed, an hour or two after midnight some hundreds of his people, old and young, flocked to his house; and for nearly three hours did this holy confessor preach and pray. Then followed the sorrowful parting of the beloved pastor from the flock he loved.

On that day he proceeded to the county jail at Ilchester. No officer attended him; he himself was entrusted with the mittimus,—a circumstance not without its parallel in those strange days, shewing how firm was the confidence felt by their persecutors in the integrity and honour of the Nonconformist sufferers, and their assurance that whatever they undertook they would perform. As Joseph Alleine left his lodging, the streets were lined with friends—some followed him for miles; and their piercing expressions of lamentation proved the bitterest part of his trial. When he reached Ilchester, the gaoler was for a time absent; and the good pastor used his short remaining liberty in preaching to the people then gathered together to see him enter his prison.

---

\* Continued from p. 302.



house. This he called his "consecration service." Could a painter have a better subject for his art than this travel-worn minister standing outside the prison in that quaint old borough town, and preaching with apostolic earnestness and courage to the astonished people? When the gaoler returned, Mr. Alleine entered his prison, probably with a lighter heart than they who quit such a place generally have. In the Bridewell chamber over the common gaol he found his friend Mr. Norman, the ejected minister of Bridgwater. By the help of Mr. Stanford's description, let us look at the interior of the prison:

"Crowded in this one apartment night and day, he, with his companions, spent the next four months. Fifty Quakers were there, seventeen Baptists, and very soon thirteen ministers were brought, all taken like himself, for the high crimes of preaching and prayer. The stifling atmosphere was made more stifling still by the many visitors. The summer sun struck fiercely on the roof all day, and so low was the roof-tree, that at night, when lying on their mattresses, they could touch the glowing tiles. Gasping for life, they had sometimes to break the glass, or rend away one of the tiles for air. Night and day they had but the same scanty accommodation; their beds were their only tables, and all the privacy that they could contrive, was made by a mat drawn across the room. Night and day their ears were stung by the songs, the curses, and the clanking chains of the felons in the cells below. If they ventured out of their deadly vapour-bath into the prison court, besides these sounds, they were still more afflicted by the sights of loathsome and pestilential wretchedness that crossed their path, for the criminal prisoners were sure to be all there too. When they rushed back to their chamber, and sought peace in united prayer, sad to say, they were disturbed by some of their associates in suffering for conscience sake. Mrs. Alleine says, that 'the Quakers would molest them by their cavils in the times of their preaching, praying, and singing, and would come and work in their callings just by them, while they were at their duties.'"—Pp. 214, 215.

The imprisoned preachers held a daily religious service, sometimes a public one, preaching from behind the prison bars to the people without, some of whom came ten miles to hear these good men, faithful and earnest though in bonds. Alleine's good wife followed him to Ilchester, and was presently permitted to bear her husband company. He was sometimes allowed the luxury of a morning and evening walk in the country. Supplied by the watchful love of friends with all he needed, he endured his bonds with a cheerful spirit. When the time of his trial approached, the grand jury did not find the bill against him; but he was nevertheless put on his trial before Sir Robert Foster, then the unworthy Lord Chief Justice of England.

The account of his trial is given from a narrative in Alleine's own hand, now, we suppose, for the first time printed from the Baxter MSS. in Williams's Library. The defence was entrusted to Mr. Thomas Bampfield, a timid man, but reputedly a good

lawyer, and one whose convictions and sympathies were with the persecuted Nonconformists. Threats were used in the first instance to deter the counsel from appearing in court; but when these failed and he entered at the call of the prisoner, the Judge disgraced himself by attempting to intimidate the counsel. "Mr. Bampffield," said he, "I must tell you, before you plead for another,—I must tell you that you had need answer for yourself. You are here presented to me for being a Nonconformist to the Church of the land, and an abettor of Nonconformists." The counsel knew his position too well to heed the implied threat, and said, "My Lord, to that charge I shall answer in due time and place." The trial proceeded. A witness was produced who was willing to swear this or that, and to extend his evidence at the suggestion of the Bench to any extent; and, notwithstanding inconsistencies and contradictions in the evidence, the jury followed the direction of the Judge, and brought Alleine in guilty. Before sentence was passed, Alleine thus addressed his Judge:

"My lord, I am glad that it hath appeared before my countrey, that whatever I am charged with, I am guilty of nothing but doing my duty; all that did appeare by the evidence being, that I had sung a psalme, and instructed my family (others being there), and both in mine owne house; and if nothing that hath been urged will satisfy, I shall with all cheerfulness and thankfulness accept whatsoever sentence your lordship shall pronounce upon me, for so good and righteous a cause."

And then the Judge, addressing Alleine, said—

"Inasmuch as you are the bell-wether of a naughtie flocke, and a ringleader of evil men; and this county, and especially this place, are noted for these seditious meetings, by reason whereof the King and the Counsell are in many feares, and new warres like to be hatched, and as you doe, instead of repenting, aggravate your fault by your obstinate carriage, the judgment of the Court is that you be fined a hundred markes, and lie in jayle till you have paid it, and given security for the good behaviour."

When the prisoner left the bar, his words were, "Glory to God, that hath accounted me worthy to suffer for his gospel!"

For twelve months Mr. Alleine lay in that foul and narrow prison at Ilchester. Presently he had too many companions in bonds, men whose only crime was their piety, and their determination to fear God rather than man. The names of some of them are preserved. There were Mr. Stephen Coven, ejected from Sanford Peveril; Mr. Thomas Powell, from St. Sidwell's, Exeter; Mr. Humphrey Phillips, late a Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford; Mr. Henry Parsons, Mr. Tobias Willes and Mr. John Torner. Here were mingled in the same prison, Presbyterians, Baptists, Independents and Quakers,—all (except the poor fanatical Quakers) agreeing to carry on public worship, and to preach each in his turn from the prison grate. It was in the gloomy and filthy dungeon at Ilchester that Joseph Alleine com-



posed many of the devotional and other religious works, of which the dingy copies still extant are highly prized by the collectors of Nonconformist literature. But one employment by which he solaced his prison months was the composition of letters on religious subjects, chiefly practical, which he sent commonly each week to distant friends, and especially to his bereaved flock at Taunton. We can well understand how fondly these costly epistles were read and listened to by little knots of Nonconformists sorrowing for their persecuted pastor, and how deep the impression made by these pastoral counsels! Copies of them were circulated from family to family and from district to district; and as the letters penned by the Marian martyrs were zealously circulated amongst the people and tended much to bind them to the Reformation, so a century later the letters of the persecuted ministers awoke in the minds of numbers, especially amongst the yeomen and common people, a life-long interest in the principles of Protestant Nonconformity.

Mr. Stanford must describe for us the other prison toils of Joseph Alleine:

“His labours in the ward were not merely those of a writer. ‘Here,’ writes his wife, ‘he and his companions had very great meetings, week-days and Sabbath-days, and many days of humiliation and thanksgiving. The Lord’s days many hundreds came.’ Here, too, he held constant conferences with his people; here he taught all the children who were sent to him, and invented plans for the elder to teach the younger when he was gone. He also sent out catechisms to be distributed among the poor families of Ilchester and the surrounding villages. The gaol chaplain falling ill, he dared to take his place, and, until prohibited, was much with the felons, preaching to them, talking to them, and, by gifts to relieve their physical misery, trying to win his way to their souls. Unhasting, unresting, month after month, he thus worked on, and sometimes after these varied toils all day, kept on his day-clothes all night, having only time for one or two hours’ sleep; for he always rose at four o’clock in the morning, to begin those secret prayers which he felt to be more essential than ever.”—Pp. 276, 277.

These things excited the wrath of the justices, and Alleine and his friend Mr. Norman were plainly told, if they did not desist they should be banished. When at length he was released, he immediately resumed those ministerial offices the exercise of which had cost him so dear, preaching on the Sunday to not less than four different assemblies of his people. He continued as before, during the week days, his visits to distant and destitute churches. There came into force the Conventicle Act, that abominable law by which the flock as well as the pastor was exposed to penalties, imprisonment and banishment itself for the offence of joining in social worship. The presence of five persons in addition to the ordinary household, made the act of worship an illegal conventicle; imprisonment followed a second conviction, and banishment a third. Many of the Taunton Dissenters were,

under the provisions of this Act, carried off from the meeting-place to prison.

The toils and anxieties of Mr. Alleine, acting on a frame previously exhausted by the rigours of a twelvemonth's imprisonment, broke him down, and he fell into a dangerous sickness. By the next persecuting law, the Five-Mile Act, he was driven from Taunton and the hundred hospitable homes ever open to him amongst his flock. He sought a shelter from the storm of persecution at Wellington, where he presently resumed his preaching. Informers were quickly on his track. It is not a little to the honour of the Nonconformists of Somersetshire, that at this the hottest hour of persecution, three candidates sought and received ordination from the hands of Mr. Alleine and others. Men who could enter on the duties and dangers of such a ministry, were worthy to preach the gospel of the crucified and risen Christ!

Mr. Alleine's feeble condition made it expedient that he should visit the mineral waters at Devizes. Before setting out, he proposed holding a meeting for thanksgiving for special mercies. In the midst of their worship, informers and magistrates broke in upon them, and Mr. Alleine was again in the power of enemies. He refused on conscientious grounds to pay the fine, and was committed to prison. Some of his Taunton flock were on this occasion the companions of his tribulation. He found sweet employment in ministering to them and strengthening their souls by his pastoral counsels. On the morning of their release, he gave to the inmates of the prison a parting address, full of practical wisdom and the moderation of the true Christian. He warned his companions in sufferings not to revile their persecutors—not to allow their thanksgivings to God to degenerate into vain glory and carnal triumph—not to be seduced by a vain spirit of martyrdom, and become prodigal of their liberty and slight the rules of prudence. On the other hand, he cautioned them against allowing the spirit of fear to make them decline from the path of duty. "Hold on in your duty," said this consistent apostle, "whatsoever it cost you."

Not much now remains to tell of the life of this holy confessor. The oil was nearly spent, and the hour of darkness was nigh. The last imprisonment, coming at a time of great bodily weakness, and hindering as it did the rest and other remedial means recommended to him, had hastened the beginning of the end. He spent a month at Devizes, the place having the double recommendation to a sick Nonconformist minister of medicinal advantages and comparative quiet from the disturbance of apparitors and informers. He was enabled to return to Taunton, apparently better. Then he visited Dorchester, and put himself under the care of Dr. Loss, a benevolent physician, who was a great benefactor to the persecuted Nonconformist divines of that



district. Here kindness and reverence, such as a saintly man like Alleine well deserved, cheered his passage to the grave. The widow of a minister named Bartlett opened her house and gave the dying man the kindest welcome. The physician proved a good Samaritan, visiting his patient twice a day for fourteen weeks, always declining to receive a fee. But the case was in fact hopeless. Paralysis had seized and disabled the poor sufferer. He lingered through the winter, cheered by innumerable tokens of respect and sympathy. At this time there came to him the tidings of the death of his friend, brother and fellow-prisoner, Mr. Norman, of Bridgwater. For a short time there was amendment, and Mr. Alleine was carried back in a litter to his beloved Taunton. Thence he was taken to Bath, where he was sufficiently well to enjoy the society of Mr. Howe, of Mr. Fairclough, and of the ministers of Bristol who went over to visit him. He had also sufficient strength to pay a visit to his friend, Mr. Joseph Barnard, who lived about five miles from Bath, and in concert with him devised and carried into effect "a thank-offering to God," which consisted in the printing and gratuitous circulation amongst the churches in Wiltshire of 6000 copies of the Assembly's Catechism. And now the work of life was done. Before he left the roof of his friend, his life strength began rapidly to ebb. He was carried back to Bath, and there, in November 1668, after some restless buffetings, doubtless the manifestations of disease acting on the brain, his spirit quietly passed on. His noble-hearted wife was with him, soothing him and praying with him to the end. In accordance with his wish, his body was carried to Taunton, followed by Mr. Howe and other sincere mourners, and buried in the chancel of the church where he had loved to preach. A beautifully pathetic sermon was preached on the occasion, and afterwards printed, by Mr. George Newton, from Luke xxiii. 28—"Daughters of Jerusalem, weep not for me, but weep for yourselves and for your children."

Of Joseph Alleine, it has been well said by the late William Rhodes, in words quoted by Mr. Stanford:

"He possessed all the intensity and refinement of the Puritan piety—a piety hitherto unequalled in the history of our race—without any tincture of its undue austerity and seclusion from the innocent graces of life. In religious fidelity and tenderness, in holy severity of self-government, in constant solitudes and toils for the salvation of men, in ardour and elevation of soul under prolonged sufferings, in frequent and lofty converse with eternal things, he was scarcely inferior to Paul himself. \* \* \* He united in perfection what is so seldom attained, the delight and grandeur of contemplative devotion with untired activity in performing the common duties of time."

The sanctity of his life, and his Christ-like patience under undeserved sufferings, made a profound impression on the minds of his contemporaries.

Reference has already been made to a tribute to the character of Alleine from one of the Fellows of his College, who contributed an important chapter to the life of Dr. Edmund Staunton. He is speaking of those who had been trained under him, and says,

"I cannot refrain, but must mention one of them, viz., Mr. Joseph Alleine, late minister of the gospel at Taunton, in Somersetshire; for as he was a great comfort to this holy man while he continued in the College, so it did revive him to hear (for he was often enquiring after such as had been of his house as a father after his children) that he proved so eminently pious and useful a man in the Church of God. But had he lived to see the relation of his life now published since his death, he would have fallen into an extacie of joy. And I have so much charity for some that were instrumental about his great sufferings and often imprisonments, as to believe that, if they would please to read the relation aforesaid, wherein both Conformists and Nonconformists agree to give him a high testimony for his great parts, learning, peaceable spirit, quiet deportment, zeal of the right kind, with ardent love to God and man, extending to the worst of his enemies, their hearts would smite them for giving so good a man so much trouble; however, he is now *where the weary are at rest.*"

Mr. Alleine's repute for holiness and patience had something to do with the extraordinary popularity of his works, and especially of his "Alarm to the Unconverted," a posthumous publication which did not see the light till 1671. But the fact that it has run through very many large editions, and that it has been translated into several languages, shews that its pathetic appeals to the religious conscience, its earnest devotional spirit and the unmistakable zeal for practical religion which, notwithstanding its Calvinistic doctrine, characterize it throughout, have met some of the deepest religious wants of the human soul.

In parting with our subject, we desire to express our hearty commendation of the spirit, catholic and tender, with which Mr. Stanford has executed this biography. Its literary execution is in good taste, and the narrative never flags. Well would it be could the history of Nonconformity in each county or considerable district of England be presented to the public in a shape equally respectable and attractive.

Before parting with the volume, we must notice one or two slight defects. The remarks on Glanville, the latitudinarian rector of Bath, are scarcely conceived in the liberal spirit of the other parts of the volume. Mr. Stanford might surely have found better reasons for thinking it possible to esteem him than that Anthony Wood reviled him. True, he was strong in his antipathy to Calvinism, but his feelings against the men who held its dogmas were not bitter. In his account of the trial of Alleine (p. 233), Mr. Stanford gives a wrong explanation of the legal phrase *to traverse*. It does not mean "to arrest judgment,"



but to postpone the trial—to put it over to another assize or session.

Mr. Stanford names a work which he finds announced in one of Mr. Newton's books, and supposes it to have something to do with the sternness of Puritan domestic discipline. The work is entitled, "The Husband's Authority Unvail'd; wherein it is moderately discussed whether it be fit or lawful for a Good Man to beat his Bad Wife. From an Inner Cloyster of the Temple, by Moses a Vauts, a Faithful Votary and Free Denizen of the Commonwealth of Israel. London, 1650." 4to, 100 pp. Had Mr. Stanford the good fortune to possess this curious book, he would have known that it is mystical and allegorical. It is not easy to attach a meaning to all of it; but the leading design of the writer is to represent Christ as the good husband, and the bad wife is the unfaithful church, which needs by the stripes of persecution to be recalled to truth. It is not safe to trust any title-page as an exponent of the subject, least of all in a book of the Puritan era.

---

#### HISTORY OF TOXTETH-PARK CHAPEL.

THE following history is taken principally from a history compiled many years ago by Mr. Henry Taylor (now of London), and existing only in manuscript, which I have his permission thus to make public. To this I have made some additions from a manuscript kindly lent to me by the Rev. Dr. Raffles (distinguishing these by brackets), and from other sources within my own knowledge.

JOHN ROBBERDS, B.A., Minister.

*Toxteth Park, Liverpool, May, 1862.*

"THE history of Toxteth-Park chapel is, in fact, that of Non-conformity in Liverpool; most of the other Dissenting churches having sprung from this source, as the increase of population in the town, or scruples as to matters of doctrine or discipline, from time to time led to secessions from it.\* The reversion in fee-simple of Toxteth Park (a short time previously a Royal domain), was granted by King James I. in 1604 or 1605 to Sir Richard Molyneux. At this time it contained no place of worship. On the disparking of the domain, it was allotted to various tenants,

---

\* "An exception must be made to this as regards the Calvinistic Baptists, who came originally from Hill Cliffe, near Warrington, in 1700. A house was licensed by them at Low Hill, and about fourteen years after a chapel was there erected, adjoining to a piece of ground which had been given as a burial-ground, and which still remains. Mr. Peter Davenport was the first minister. About the year 1729, another chapel was erected in what is now called Byrom Street, where the first preacher was Mr. John Turner. In 1772, Mr. Samuel Medley became the minister. He was very popular, so that it became necessary to build a larger chapel in the same street, 1789. The old chapel is now called St. Stephen's church."

for whose use, in 1618, the chapel was originally erected, but whether at their own charge, or that of Sir Richard Molyneux, is uncertain. It is at least clear that it was built on his land, and this may have given rise to the tradition that it was designed for Catholic worship, to which religion Sir Richard Molyneux belonged. The payment, during many years, of the tithes of Toxteth to the minister of the chapel, must undoubtedly have been by permission of the Molyneux family, the King not interfering.”\*

[In the Bishop of Chester’s (Gastrell) *Notitia Cestriensis*, there occurs this notice:

“Park chapel, in Tocksteath Park, near Childwall, supposed to be extra-parochial, or in the parish of Lancaster, possessed by Dissenters, held by a lease from Lord Molineux, and was given in as a house belonging to his lordship by his agents when they registered his estate, anno 1718. This was a park and waste land without inhabitants in Queen Elizabeth’s reign. There is a tradition that an Irish bishop has preached several Sundays in this chappell.”—ED. C. R.]

[I add the following from Dr. Raffles: “The birth-place of Nonconformity in these parts is Toxteth Park. This suburban district of Liverpool was originally a Royal forest, and so continued till the 35th year of the reign of Queen Elizabeth (1593), when it was granted by that sovereign to the Earl of Derby. It was shortly after disparked and let out on leases in several farms. A few years after, in 1605, it was sold to Sir Richard Molyneux, an ancestor of the Earl of Sefton, who, notwithstanding the large sales made in more recent times, holds a considerable portion of it to this day. An inquisition was held by order of James I., from which it appears that there were on the estate, at the period of its passing into the Molyneux family, only twenty dwellings, and no church or chapel. But though the population was scanty, it seems to have been of the right sort, for it consisted almost entirely of Nonconformists, and on that account tradition says that it was commonly called the ‘Holy Land.’ There was not a Churchman or a Roman Catholic in the whole district. The

---

\* “The family possessed the advowson of the neighbouring parish church of Walton, on behalf of which they had, previously to the erection of the chapel, put in a claim (then undecided) to the tithes of Toxteth Park. They were paid to the minister of the Park chapel till the passing of the Bartholomew Act in 1662 (or a little before), when a claim was again advanced by the parson of Walton, probably because the former had refused to comply with the provisions of that Act. [Toxteth Park is now extra-parochial, paying no tithes or church-rates.] The property of the chapel appears never to have been vested in the congregation in any way whatever.” [Dr. Raffles says, “The exact date of the erection of the first chapel in Toxteth Park is not known. It was doubtless shortly after Mr. Mather’s coming as a minister, if not at that precise time, and it was in connection with the then existing establishment; tithes were paid to the minister of this chapel at any rate till the year 1650, after which they were claimed by the rector of Walton.”]



land being chiefly in the hands of the Dissenters, owing to the persecuting spirit of the times, they wisely resolved not to become the instruments of their own torment by admitting their enemies to take root in the soil. They were in the habit of meeting for worship in a retired glen, then perhaps but little known, but familiar to us under the name of the 'Dingle;' when one or two were placed upon the watch to give timely notice of the approach of informers. 'Down with the Rump!' was the cry that assailed them wherever they went, often mingled with the foulest abuse and the most horrid blasphemies. A relic of these prayer-meetings, for such they were, remained in the memory of persons yet living, when I went to reside in the Park in April, 1812."]

"Many circumstances combine to prove the pious disposition of the settlers on the disparking of Toxteth, who were doubtless distinguished as of the class denominated Puritans, though in many points perhaps willing to conform with the requisitions of the Established Church. For a series of years tradition speaks of these people as pre-eminent for peaceable conduct and general respectability of character; and the names given to particular portions of the domain (some of which still remain) give testimony, by their scriptural origin, to their religious zeal.\* No doubt these dispositions and habits were cherished by the example and precepts of the person chosen to fill the office of first pastor of the Park chapel. This was Mr. Richard Mather, a name at once celebrated in the long list of sufferers in his time in the cause of religion and conscience, and venerable as the ancestor of a noted race of preachers and authors during several generations, both in England and America. A notice of Mr. Mather is to be met with in Neal's 'History of the Puritans,' Vol. II. p. 264. In Elliott's 'New-England Biographical Dictionary' is the following, under the head 'Richard Mather:' 'For more than a century the name of Mather was known and celebrated through every part of the land; many branches are now cut off, and we must go out of the State of Massachusetts to find one engaged in the work of the ministry, though formerly so many of them were distinguished among the angels of the churches. In all ages there have been stars to lead men to the knowledge of the Lord Jesus Christ; angelical men employed in the ministry of our Lord have been these happy stars. And we in the West have been so happy as to see some of the first magnitude, among which was Mr. Richard Mather.' The life of Mr. Mather was written by his grandson, the celebrated Dr. Cotton Mather, which may be seen in his 'Magnalia Christi Americana,' published in 1702. A more detailed account of him had previously been

---

\* There is, for example, a farm still known by the name of Jericho; the stream flowing from it into the Mersey is called the Jordan. The prominent rock between the two branches of the Dingle is called David's Throne, and a neighbouring cave is called Adam's Buttery.

given by his friend the Rev. Samuel Clarke, in his book (now very rare) entitled, 'The Lives of sundry Eminent Men in this later Age,' printed in 1683. From this latter work, the following extracts are taken: \* 'Richard Mather was born in a village called Lowton, situate in the parish of Winwick, in the county of Lancaster, Anno Christi 1596. His parents, Thomas and Margaret Mather, were of ancient families in Lowton aforesaid; but by reason of some mortgages they were reduced into a low condition in regard to their outward estate. Nevertheless, God so disposed and inclined their hearts that they were willing and careful to train up their son in good literature. And now, his parents being strongly bent to have their son a schollar, they sent him to the school at Winwick,'"—["at that time," says Dr. Raffles, "in great repute as a seminary of learning; and with so much diligence did he avail himself of the advantages he there enjoyed, that at the early age of fifteen he himself became a most accomplished and efficient instructor of others." †]

"Having thus continued long at school, he had a call and opportunity of leaving his father's family, the occasion whereof was this. At a place called Toxteth Park, near unto Liverpool, there were many prudent and religious people, who, being desirous of their own good and of their posterity after them, designed to erect a school among them for the better education of their children; and upon consideration God put it into their minds to send to the schoolmaster at Winwick to inquire whether he had any of his scholars whom he would recommend to them as fit for such a service. And he having received such a message, presently communicated it to this his scholar and to his father. The son was rather desirous to have gone to the University, but his father closed with the motion, and in conclusion it was embraced by all. And now our young Mather left the school and his father's house, and removed to Toxteth, Anno Christi 1611, there to teach school,'" ["wherein," says Dr. Raffles, "he taught and ruled with such admirable skill, that he soon became highly distinguished in his profession, 'carrying it,' as Cotton Mather quaintly expresses it, 'though but 15 years of age, with such

---

\* The life given by Clarke in his "Lives" is, however, a mere abridgment of a work published at Cambridge (N.A.), in 1760, by Increase Mather, the youngest son of Richard Mather. The exact title of that interesting volume, which is equally scarce in England and America, is, "The Life and Death of that Reverend Man of God, Mr. Richard Mather, Teacher of the Church in Dorchester, New England." It has been recently (1850) reprinted at Boston for the Dorchester Antiquarian and Historical Society, and forms with the "Journal of Richard Mather, 1635," No. 3 of that Society's "Collections." The Life was not professedly written by Increase Mather, but was sent forth under his name and sanction in the form of a dedication "To the Church and Inhabitants of Dorchester in N.E."—ED. C. R.

† According to Dr. Cotton Mather, he was treated with cruel severity by the schoolmaster; so much so that, had it not been for his father's wisdom and firmness, he would have been taken from school, in compliance with his own earnest importunity, and devoted to some secular calling.

wisdom, kindness and grave reservation, as to be loved and feared by his young folks much above the most that ever used the *ferula*.' His lodging at that time was with Mr. Edward Aspinwal, of Toxteth. He was a man of eminent piety and most exemplary walk. And it was the deportment of that holy man that first arrested his attention and induced in his mind the serious apprehension that he was himself *out of the way*. This, with the preaching of Mr. Harrison, who was then a famous minister at Huyton, and the perusal of Perkins's work, shewing *How far a Reprobate may go in Religion*, were the means of his saving conversion to God. So strong were his convictions of sin, and so terrible the agonies of his mind on their account, that he would often retire into secret places to bemoan himself; but when about 18 years of age, God graciously appeared to heal his broken heart, and he experienced joy and peace in believing. At length, having trained many for the University who were sent to him from remote places for that purpose, he resolved to go there himself." "In prosecution of his resolves, he went to Oxford, and was admitted into Brazenose Colledge; and being settled there he was variously affected; for it much rejoiced him to find many there who had been his quondam schollars.' 'But not having spent so much time in Oxford as he could have wished that he might have done, the people of Toxteth, whose children had been trained up by him, sent to him, desiring him that he would return to them, to instruct, not so much their children as themselves, and that not in mere human literature, but in the things of God: and this call, after mature deliberation, he accepted of. Being returned to Toxteth, he preached his first sermon, Nov. 30th,\* Anno Christi, 1618, most probably at the opening of the chapel.' 'There was a very great concourse of people (the word of God being precious at that time in those parts) to hear him, and his labours were highly accepted of by those who were judicious. Such was the vastness of his memory, as that the things which he had prepared and intended to deliver at that time, contained no less than six long sermons.'" ["But assuredly," says Dr. Raffles, "if on that occasion he delivered the whole of what he had thus prepared, of all the long sermons ever preached, that must have been the longest."] We certainly must have sadly degenerated from our Presbyterian forefathers in our powers either as preachers or as hearers. I transcribe in a note below, from a MS. lent me by one of the present family of Mather in Liverpool, a curious illustration of the humble reverence of congregations, even a century later, in relation to those who preached to them the "precious" word of divine truth.† "The people having now had some taste and tryal of

\* Dr. Raffles's MS., following Cotton Mather, gives the date Nov. 13.

† "To the Rev. J. L. [Lawton.] We whose names are subscribed or endors'd, the adult part of Christ's church stately meeting and now met in Gate-acre



his gifts, were the more importunate in their desires to have him continue and fix amongst them; and because that could not be done without ordination, they urged him to accept thereof; and he, having not at that time studied that part of ceremonious conformity, yielded unto the motion, and accordingly he (together with many others on the same day) was ordained by Dr. Morton, the then Bishop of Chester, after the mode of those times. The ordination being ended, the Bishop singled out Mr. Mather from among the rest, saying, 'I have something to say to you, between you and me alone.' Mr. Mather was hereupon afraid that some informations had been given in against him to the Bishop for his non-conformity, and because of his Puritanism, thereby to prejudice him. But it fell out to be far otherwise; for when the Bishop had him alone, he spake thus unto him: 'I have an earnest request unto you, and you must not deny me; it is that you will pray for me; for I know (said he) the prayers of men that fear God will avail much, and such an one I believe you to be.'" [This act of conformity afterwards was a weight on his conscience. In the Life by Increase Mather, there is this remarkable passage: "Nevertheless, after that the Lord gave him to see the evil of the sin of conformity in the whole latitude of it (for as to the substance of conformity, even from his first entrance upon the ministry, he saw the evil thereof, and was by Divine grace kept from being stained therewith), his conforming (although it was at the desires of his people) to accept of this *ordination* from the *Prelate* was no small grief of heart to him. Many years after, one of his sons, taking notice of a

---

chappel, being much concern'd for its lasting prosperity, do in behalf of ourselves and all we can influence, resolve and declare that none of us will, without necessity pressing us, and plain to all, remove our dwellings to such distance as would suspend our present special relation to the said church, or render our attendance there impracticable. The same concern moves us ardently to desire you to be and continue our pastor, to catechize and administer all other ordinances to and amongst us publicly and privatly (according to their respective natures), in such manner as you shall judge agreeable to God's word and most conducive to our souls' good. Having hitherto acquiesc'd in and approv'd all your past administrations, we are the more zealous in the above request, and the more cordially promise to OBEY YOU, and submit ourselves so long as God Almighty shall permit and incline you to officiate amongst us. We will seperatly and joynly endeavour to have our conversation in all things becoming the Gospel of Christ. We will exhort and reprove one another in a spirit of meekness on all proper occasions, and take care that sin be not encourag'd by our neglect of these duties, nor you nor others griev'd and burthen'd by the hearing of private crimes, small or great, which one or a few of us can be instrumental to reform. As to irregularities, great or small, otherwise circumstanced, in cases wherein our private labours do not succeed, we engage to accept and aid your exercise of discipline; and if any of us thus engag'd, or others of us not so explicitly engag'd, withdraw in resentment of censure pass'd, or design'd, or expected, we will not be so injurious as to judge or imagine you a disturber or diminisher of our society, it being obvious that only the obstinate person or persons so withdrawing are guilty. We are most sincere and cheerful in all and every of the above resolutions, promises and engagements, as witness our hands this 12th day of July, Anno Domini 1730."

torn parchment in his father's study, inquired what it is; unto whom his father replied, that he received it when he was ordained by the Bishop: *And (said he) I tore it, because I took no pleasure in keeping a monument of my sin and folly in submitting to that superstition, the very remembrance whereof is grievous unto me.*"—ED. C. R.]

"Being thus settled in his ministry at Toxteth (where I was acquainted with him), he resolved to change his single condition, and accordingly he became a suitor to Mrs. Katharine Houl,\* the daughter of Edward Houl, Esq., of Bury, in Lancashire: she had (and that deservedly) the repute of a very godly and prudent maid.' 'And the match was consummated on Sept. 29, 1624.' 'By her God gave him six sons, four whereof, namely, Samuel, Timothy, Nathaniel and Joseph, were born in Old England, and two, namely, Eliazar and Increase, in New.† After his marriage, he removed his habitation three miles from Toxteth to Much Woolton; yet he was wont constantly, both summer and winter, to preach the word at Toxteth every Lord's-day.' 'And once a fortnight, on the Tuesdays, he kept a lecture at a market town called Prescot.'" [I add from Dr. Raffles's MS.: "For fifteen years this excellent man conducted his ministry in Toxteth Park; a chapel being erected, wherein he preached twice every Sabbath, and often on holy days, which in those times were of frequent occurrence, not because he regarded any day as holy but the Christian Sabbath, but because on those days the cessation of labour gave the people who were so inclined an opportunity to hear."'] [He valued the opportunity of teaching the people, of whom large assemblies could then be obtained in other parishes as well as at Toxteth; for, as his biographer remarks, "it is good casting the net where there is much fish." He also did not, like some of the early Nonconformists, scruple to preach at funerals. He avoided the practice, however, of praising the dead, "his speech on such occasions being taken up with instructing the living concerning death, the resurrection, the judgment to come, and the like seasonable truths."—ED. C. R.] "After he had thus spent painfully and faithfully fifteen years in the work of the ministry, He that holds the stars in his right hand had more work for him to do elsewhere; and therefore Satan's rage must be suffered to break forth, to the stopping of his

---

\* Cotton Mather spells it Holt. She died in New England, to his great sorrow. He afterwards married the widow of Mr. John Cotton.

† "Many years before Mr. Mather died, he had the comfort of seeing four sons that were preachers of no mean consideration among the people of God." "And since his death our common Lord has been served by Mr. Samuel Mather, pastor of a church in Dublin; Mr. Nathaniel Mather, pastor after him of the same church, but before that of Barnstable, and then of Rotterdam, and since that of a church in London; Mr. Eliazar Mather, pastor of a church at our Northampton; and Mr. Increase Mather, teacher of a church in Boston, and President of Harvard Colledge."—Dr. Cotton Mather's Magnalia, &c.

mouth. The lecture which he kept at Prescott caused him to be much taken notice of, and so he became more, to the adversaries of the truth, an object of envy.' 'Where complaints being made against him for his nonconformity to the ceremonies, he was suspended in August, 1633, under which he continued till November following; but then, by means of the intercession of some gentlemen of Lancashire, and by the influence of one Simon Biby (who was nearly related to the Bishop), he was again restored to the exercises of his public ministry. But this restored liberty continued not long; for, Anno Christi 1634, Bishop Neale (who was sometime by King James pleasantly admonished of his preaching Popery, because by his carriage he taught the people to pray for a blessing upon his dead predecessor), being now become Archbishop of York, sent his visitors into the diocese of Chester, who being come into the country kept their court at Wigan, where (among others) Mr. Mather was convened before them, and by them was suspended meerly for his nonconformity.'" [Dr. Raffles says, "The result of this suspension, however, was, on his part, a closer investigation of the subject of church government and discipline, which led him to the firm conviction that the congregational form, as taught by Cartwright and others, was alone scriptural;\* and as he failed not to act up to his convictions, this led to a second suspension, which was not withdrawn. This took place in 1634, when Dr. Cousins was sent into Lancashire as one of the visitors of the Archbishop of York, to discover and root out nonconformity from the land." "He held his court at Wigan, and Mr. Mather was summoned to appear before him. No charge was brought against him but that of nonconformity, his reasons for which his judges were reluctant to hear; but he, like another Stephen, was so filled with the spirit of God, that he spake freely and boldly his mind before them, and they were constrained to listen to what he had to say. On a review of that day's proceedings, he made the following entry in his diary: 'In the passages of that day I have this to bless the name of God for, that the tenor of their threatening words, of their pursevents and the rest of their pomp, did not terrify my mind, but that I could stand before them without being daunted in the least measure, but answered for myself such words of truth and soberness as the Lord put into my mouth, not being afraid of their faces at all; which supporting and comforting presence of the Lord I count not much less mercy than if I had been altogether preserved out of their hands.' All efforts to obtain a removal of this suspension were in vain; but when the visitors were informed that he had been a minister for fifteen years, and all that time had never worn a surplice, one of

---

\* Dr. Cotton Mather also says of him, however, "He wrote a treatise to prove that whatever *privilege* and *liberty* may belong to the *fraternity*, the *rule* of the Church belongs only to its *presbytery*."—*Magnalia*, &c., p. 128, fol. ed.



them swore that it had been better for him that he had gotten seven bastards.”\*] “‘The case being thus, he betook himself to a private life; and no hope appearing that he should enjoy his liberty in the land of his nativity, foreseeing also the approaching calamities of England, he meditated a removal from thence into New England.’” [He drew up a detailed statement of the arguments whereby he was convinced that his departure from his native land and his removal to New England partook of the nature of a “Divine call.” His biographer inserts them at length in the *Life*, that posterity might see “what were the swaying motives which prevailed with the first fathers of New England to venture upon that unparalleled undertaking, even to transport themselves, their wives and little ones, over the rude waves of the vast ocean, into a land which was not sown.”

This statement of arguments was placed before many of the “godly ministers and other Christians in Lancashire at several meetings for that end.” He was greatly strengthened in his purpose of emigration by letters from Mr. Cotton and Mr. Hooker, written from New England. The latter used these expressions: “If I may speak my own thoughts fully and freely, though there are very many places where men may receive and expect more earthly commodities, yet I do believe there is no place this day upon the face of the earth where a gracious heart and a judicious head may receive more spiritual good to himself, and do more temporal and spiritual good to others.”—ED. C. R.]

“‘Being now fully satisfied concerning the clearness of his call to New England, and his people at Toxteth, who did so dearly love his person and highly prize his ministry, yet now thought that God called him to leave them: after many prayers and extraordinary seeking unto God, he resolved and engaged upon the transportation of himself and family thither.’

“‘His parting with his people and friends in Lancashire was like St. Paul’s taking his leave of Ephesus, with much sorrow, many tears being shed by those that expected to see his face no more in this world. He began his journey in April, 1635, and travelled to Bristow, purposing to take shipping there.† In this journey he was forced to change his outward habit, that he might travel incognito, because pursevents were designed to apprehend him. But by this means he came safe and unmolested to Bristow. From Bristow they set sail for New England, May 23, 1635.’” [“After a most tempestuous passage,‡ he landed in Boston,

---

\* A significant indication what “whited sepulchres” many of the surpliced clergy at that time were reputed to be!

† A curious contrast to the present day, that he should find it necessary to travel from Liverpool to Bristol in order to set sail for America.

‡ The incidents of Richard Mather’s voyage are graphically told in a diary, happily preserved in the collections of the Dorchester Antiquarian and Historical Society. We had marked passages for insertion from this curious and little-known work, but must, from regard to our available space, postpone them and some other illustrative extracts to another occasion.—ED. C. R.

Aug. 17 of the same year, and there in that land of his adoption he soon became as highly distinguished as he had been in his own, and was honoured to be the father and grandfather of Increase, Samuel and Cotton Mather, divines scarcely less celebrated than himself, and the last, the well-known author of *Magnalia Christi Americana*, or the Ecclesiastical History of New England, still more so. He was also the father of Richard Mather, ejected from Burton Wood, in the county of Lancaster, and Nathaniel Mather, both men of eminent talents and usefulness in their day.”]

“‘Being thus, by a mighty hand and an outstretched arm, brought safe into New England, motions were soon presented to him from sundry towns, desiring that he would employ the talents which the Lord had enriched him with for the work of the ministry amongst them.’ ‘Being thus again settled (at Dorchester) in the Lord’s work, he therein continued to his dying day; \* the Lord making him an eminent blessing, not only unto Dorchester, but to all the churches and plantations round about him, for the space of almost four-and-thirty years.’ ‘Thus did that light, that had been shining in the church above fifty years, expire, April 22nd, Anno Christi 1669, and of his age seventy-three.’”

I add here a few extracts from Cotton Mather, characteristic both of the subject and of the writer. “His way of *preaching* was very *plain*, studiously avoiding obscure and foreign terms, and unnecessary citation of *Latine* sentences; and aims to shoot his *arrows*, not over the *heads*, but into the *hearts* of his hearers. Yet so *scripturally* and so *powerfully* did he preach his *plain sermons*, that Mr. *Hooker* would say, My brother Mather is a *mighty man*; and indeed he saw a great success of his labours, in both *Englands*, converting many souls unto God. His *voice* was loud and big, and, uttered with a deliberate vehemence, it procured unto his ministry an awful and very taking *majesty*; nevertheless, the substantial and rational matter delivered by him, caused his ministry to take yet more wherever he came. Whence, even while he was a young man, Mr. *Gellibrand*, a famous minister in *Lancashire*, hearing him, inquired what his name was? When answer was made that his name was Mather, he replied, *Nay, his name shall be Matter; for believe it, this man hath good substance in him.*” “Nevertheless, after all these works, he was, as *Nazianzen* saith of *Athanasius*, “ὕψηλος τοῖς ἔργοις, ταπεινὸς δὲ τοῖς φρονήμασι,—as *low* in his *thoughts*, as he was *high* in his *words*. He never became *twice a child* through *infirmity*, but was always one, as our Saviour hath commanded us, in *humility*.”†

[To adopt Dr. Raffles’s words: “I have dwelt thus long on

\* “Albeit his old people of *Toxteth* vehemently solicited his return unto them, when the troublesome *hierarchy* in *England* was deposed.”—*Magnalia*, &c., book iii. chap. xx. § 11, p. 126.

† *Ibid.*, § 14, pp. 127, seq.

the life of this good man, inasmuch as it presents us with the state of religion in these parts, and informs us how it fared with our forefathers 200 years ago.”]

“The successor to Mr. Mather at Toxteth was most probably\* a Mr. Huggon [or Huggin], who, it may be supposed, was less scrupulous than his predecessor as to the use of the ‘garments.’ A notice of Mr. Huggon is to be found in a Parliamentary survey, taken at Wigan, June 22, 1650, of Walton and its members, consisting of Walton, Toxteth Parke cum Smithdon, Kirkby, Formbye, Everton, West Derby, Kirkdale, Liverpoole and Bootle cum Linaker, as follows: ‘We also present and finde that there is in Toxteth Parke a sic chappell, called Toxteth chappell, and that Mr. Huggon is minister there, and is an approved minister, and hath for his salary or maintenance the proffits of the tythes of the said towne or hamell, which we conceive to be worth cleerely ffortye-five pounds p. annum, and an additional sum of tenn pounds from Mr. Ward, rector of Walton, and that the said chappell of Toxteth Parke is farr distant from any other church or chappell, and therefore we think it very fitt to be made a parish, and that these houses in Aigburgh, formerly within the parish of Childwall, to bee added unto it, viz., John Wallworth’s, Thomas Seddon’s, Richard Fisher, Ralph Whittfield, Nehemiah Brette, John Holland and George Lawrenson.”† [In the notes to *Notitia Cestriensis*, it is stated that the Committee of Plundered Ministers allowed “Mr. Thomas Huggins, an honest man and a graduate,” the tithes of Toxteth, which amounted to £60 a year.—ED. C. R.]

“In Dr. Edmund Calamy’s History of the ministers ejected from their churches by the Bartholomew Act, passed in the year 1662, we find as under, Vol. II. p. 407: ‘Walmesly chapel. Mr. Michael Briscoe, bred up in Trinity Colledge, near Dublin, in Ireland, pastour of a congregational church in this chapel. He afterwards removed thence to Toxteth Park, where he preached in the chapel jointly with Mr. Thos. Crompton. And he continued there till he died, which was in September, 1685, aged 66. He was a good scholar and a fine orator. His sermons were judicious, but his voice was low, which was more than compensated by his taking way of delivery.’

“It thus appears that Mr. Briscoe and Mr. Crompton were co-pastors at the Park chapel after Mr. Huggon, which continued till the death of the former, neither of them being removed by the Act of Uniformity, as it is recorded in Dr. Calamy’s History, in the following quotation: ‘Torkscarth-Park chappell, near Lever-

\* In the list of the presbytery for the county of Lancaster, 1646, Robert Port is named as minister of Toxteth, and a member of the fifth classis of the presbytery.—ED. C. R.

† Copied from the Parliamentary Survey of Livings, &c., in the Library at Lambeth.



pool. Mr. Thomas Crompton, M.A., born at Great Leaver, bred in Manchester school and at the university of Oxon. After the Act of Uniformity took place, he continued to enjoy the liberty of the public chappel, being some way privileged. Mr. Brisco (who lived also in the neighbourhood) and he joined together to supply it, one preaching one Lord's-day, and the other the next. He was a man of excellent ready parts and good education. After Mr. Baldwin's death he removed to Eccles. He dyed at Manchester, September 2, 1699, aged 64.'

"Mr. Baldwin, of Eccles, herein alluded to, died, as we are informed on the same authority, on the 9th of June, 1695; previously to which date, Mr. Crompton had as his associate in the ministry at the Park, Mr. Christopher Richardson, an ejected minister from Kirk Heaton, in Yorkshire, who at the same time preached in Liverpool to a society which had formed itself into a distinct congregation, being the first among the Nonconformists known there. What is known of Mr. Richardson is gathered from Palmer's Nonconformist Memorial (Vol. III. p. 439).

"Kirk Heaton. Mr. Christopher Richardson. After his ejection he retired to his house at Lassell Hall. Besides preaching on Lord's-days, he had a lecture in his house once a month, in which several of his brethren united. He afterwards went to Liverpool, where he preached once a fortnight, and the intervening day at Toxteth-Park chapel. His preaching was, to the last, very neat and accurate, though plain and popular. He had a healthful constitution, which continued till old age. He died in December, 1698, aged about 80. He was mighty in the Scriptures, being able on a sudden to expound and improve any chapter he read in the pious families which he visited. In Yorkshire he was much followed. A neighbouring minister, whose parishioners used to go to hear him, complaining once to him that he drew away his flock, Mr. Richardson answered, 'Feed them better, and they will not stray.'"

We learn from Mr. Hunter's Life of Oliver Heywood (p. 288), that in the year 1678 that eminent Presbyterian minister visited Liverpool in the month of February, and preached twice in Toxteth-Park chapel, visiting while in the neighbourhood, Mr. Briscoe, Mr. Crompton, Mr. Litherland and Mr. Atherton.

"It is probable that the rising population of Liverpool, and the increased confidence of the Dissenters, soon after the Revolution of 1688, induced them to think of a separate chapel in the town. Hitherto, both from policy and necessity, all had resorted to Toxteth-Park chapel; and tradition speaks of this even, from the persecuting spirit of the times, as attended with much difficulty. There is no doubt that Mr. Richardson was the first pastor of the new chapel, which was most likely erected about this time (for the exact date cannot be ascertained) in Castle Heys (since called Harrington Street), Liverpool. No distinct

congregation of the Independent persuasion existed in Liverpool till the year 1777, when the chapel in Newington was erected, in a considerable degree by contributors to Benn's-Garden and the Park chapels, who wished to retain in their religious system a great proportion of the Calvinistic creed. This was followed by the founding of the first church in connection with the Kirk of Scotland, in Oldham Street, in 1793."

To return to the Park chapel. [We are able to add another name to the list of early ministers at Toxteth Park. In the Dukinfield chapel register there is this entry among the deaths: "1698, Feb. 20th. Mr. Samuel Angier, of Toxteth Park, minister of the gospel, dyed Feb. 20th, was buried Wednesday the 23rd."\* To which branch of the Angier family this Samuel Angier belonged, we cannot discover. He was certainly *not* the son of John Angier, of Denton, who is mentioned in the minute-book of the Manchester classis of having been guilty of some irregularities of life not specified, and for which he was rebuked by several divines of the classis (his own father being one of them) before he was admitted to ordination. The name of this person was *John* Angier, and he settled first at Ringley chapel, near Prestwich; he was at the time of his father's death (1677) living in Lincolnshire. (See Chetham Miscellanies, Vol. II. p. 74; and Heywood's Life of John Angier, Works, Vol. I.)

There was a Samuel Angier, a pupil of Mr. Frankland's, at Natland, entering the academy April 24, 1677.

It is probably the same Samuel Angier whom Oliver Heywood calls "cousin," and of whose ordination at the house of Mr. Heywood, June 1, 1687, an account is given in Mr. Hunter's Life of Heywood, p. 244.—ED. C. R.]

It seems difficult to account for the fact that the original parochial chapel was suffered to subside into a Presbyterian meeting-house. The rector of Walton might find it convenient to discontinue the annual payment of ten pounds, and the farmers might have no objection to discontinue the payment of tithes, but it is less easy to comprehend how the rector of Walton consented to forego his claim to the tithes of Toxteth Park, in default of a conforming minister at the chapel. All that can be ascertained is, that Mr. Crompton continued to preach there, although an ejected minister, "being some way privileged," and that Toxteth Park became "extra-parochial." [During the ministry of Mr. Crompton and Mr. Briscoe, Dr. Raffles remarks that the chapel "glided into the Presbyterian form of church government, and that again, becoming less and less rigid, passed into the congregational or independent, or something nearly approaching to it. At the time of the Commonwealth, it was

\* Perhaps this entry does not make it quite certain that he was the minister of the chapel. He might only be resident in Toxteth Park, where grave-stones indicate that there was a family of that name.—J. R.

included in the fifth of the nine classical presbyteries into which the county of Lancaster was then by Act of Parliament divided; and I have understood that the last meeting of this presbytery took place at Toxteth chapel, when the celebrated Matthew Henry, the commentator, preached. From this time the succession of ministers can be accurately traced. The first was John Kenyon.\* He was brother to an eminent physician of that name in Liverpool. He was a man of finished education and polished manners, and withal was an excellent preacher, so that the chapel was well attended during his ministry. He laboured at Toxteth Park for twenty years. He died August 16, 1728 (aged 55), and was buried in the chapel-yard.† He appears to have been succeeded by a Mr. Gillibrand. He was minister but a few years, dying early of a decline. He was an amiable young man, but by no means orthodox in his theological creed, if certain MS. sermons preached at the Park chapel, and preserved in the Renshaw-Street Library, and presumed to be his, are so in reality; for in them the doctrine of the Trinity is distinctly denied.‡ He was followed by Wm. Harding, who became the minister about the year 1738. He was a man of no education or regular training for the ministry;§ but was a farmer originally at Partington, in Cheshire, and followed the same occupation in the Park. He was in the habit of reading his sermons, which are described as being long and tedious, seldom less than an hour and a half, and so destitute of evangelical truth that no one could gather his theological sentiments from them. It is no marvel that under him the congregation ‘should decline, and during the greater part of his ministry be very small.’] Mr. Henry Taylor’s account states that Mr. Harding came from Congleton, in Cheshire, in 1737, and remained minister till his death, July 15, 1776, aged 85 years. Two grandsons and a granddaughter of his, members of the congregation, died not many years ago. Mr. Harding’s grave is in the burial-ground adjoining the chapel. I am not able either to confirm or to correct Dr. Raffles’s description of him and his preaching from any other authority. [“It was in Mr. Harding’s time that

---

\* John Kenyon was a pupil of Mr. Frankland’s at Rathmel, entering the academy January 9, 1691.—ED. C. R.

† There are tablets in the present chapel to the memory of John and Peter Kennion, possibly of the same family, ob. 1785 and 1788.

‡ I have not been able to verify more conclusively this early indication of heretical doctrine.—J. R.

§ There is some reason for doubting the accuracy of this statement. Mr. William Harding was a pupil of Dr. Charles Owen, of Warrington, and was regularly ordained by the Cheshire classis, August 7, 1716. He defended on that occasion a thesis, *Quænam est consecratio Eucharistiæ?* The ministers who assisted at his ordination were Mr. Lea, Mr. Waterhouse, Mr. Fletcher and Dr. Owen. He officiated for a time at Middlewich. In 1730, he was at Partington. The following year his name is found attached to a Latin certificate of the ordination of Mr. Bond, of Stand. The minutes of the Cheshire classis are the authorities of these statements.—ED. C. R.



the chapel in Toxteth Park was rebuilt. It first underwent considerable repairs, but these were scarcely completed when the walls began to give way, and it was found necessary entirely to rebuild it. So much had the building been neglected that, prior to the first repairs, bushes actually grew out of the walls and within the pews. After the completion of these repairs, some incendiaries endeavoured to burn it down, but the combustibles which they had placed in one of the seats for that purpose happily did not ignite, though matches which had evidently been alight were found among them.”] “The Park chapel was rebuilt by voluntary subscription in the year 1774.” [“After the death of Mr. Harding, which took place at an advanced period, and after he had been laid aside for some years by the infirmities of age, the prayer-meetings which had been established in troublous times were discontinued. They were held in the afternoon of the last Thursday in every month. There were twelve houses licensed for the purpose, amongst which they circulated. They had greatly degenerated, and it was high time that they should cease, for there is reason to believe that conviviality had to a great extent supplanted the spirit of devotion. On the death of Mr. Harding, the Rev. Hugh Anderson succeeded in 1776. He was from Galloway, in North Britain. He was not decidedly evangelical in his doctrine at the first. But in his preaching he did not avow his real sentiments, if indeed he had fixed theological sentiments at all. Some who knew and loved the truth, and who had their suspicions, hoping the best, voted for him. Soon, however, they perceived their error, and joined with others in a remonstrance addressed to Mr. Anderson, but in vain; and at length, seeing no prospect of his removal, they withdrew, and, taking the Jews’ synagogue in Liverpool as a temporary place of worship, they chose the Rev. David Bruce, from the academy at Heckmondwike, in Yorkshire, as their pastor, and built Newington chapel. From Newington chapel proceeded the first Great George-Street chapel, the foundation-stone of which was laid by the lamented Spencer;\* and subsequently, in 1840, the present edifice, on the site of that building, which was entirely destroyed by fire, Feb. 19, 1840.”] To Dr. Raffles’s statement respecting Mr. Anderson, it is only fair to add that he “was ordained, with the Rev. John Yates, 1st October, 1777, when a sermon was preached and published by Dr. Enfield.” His public association with those two at the outset of his ministry, seems to indicate that, from the very first, he made no profession of orthodoxy. It is unquestionable that a division, on doctrinal grounds, took place in the congregation, which culminated in a secession of the orthodox members; but the natural inference

---

\* Dr. Raffles’s immediate predecessor, of whom he published a Memoir. He was drowned while bathing in the Mersey.

seems to be that the seceding members were the minority. Certainly many, if not the most important, of the contributors to the cost of building the present chapel, in 1774, were members of families subsequently belonging to the Unitarian body. It is, however, a fact, I believe, that, towards the close of Mr. Anderson's ministry, the congregation dwindled away.\* It revived, however, when the Rev. John Porter, now minister of the second Presbyterian meeting-house in Belfast, was chosen as his colleague in 1827. On his removal to Belfast in 1829, he was succeeded by the Rev. J. H. Thom; on his removal to Renshaw-Street chapel, Liverpool, in 1831, he was succeeded by the Rev. Charles Wicksteed; on his removal to Mill-Hill chapel, Leeds, in 1835, he was succeeded by the Rev. Henry Giles, subsequently a lecturer and author in the United States, whither he retired in 1839, and in the following year the present minister was appointed. Mr. Giles took part, in conjunction with Mr. Thom and Mr. Martineau, in the celebrated Liverpool Unitarian Controversy in 1839, the three ministers accepting a challenge to discuss the points at issue with thirteen evangelical clergymen of the Church of England. As all the successors of Mr. Anderson are thus still living, and most of them well known and highly esteemed in our churches, I abstain from any further details respecting them; but will confine myself, in conclusion, to a few statements respecting the present chapel. Though rebuilt, as stated, in 1774, it retains some traces of the older structure, such as a pointed arch which supports the roof. On the stone covering of a vault in the main aisle is a brass, with the following inscription:

"Edward Aspinwall,† of Tocksteth Park, Esquire, Departed this life in March the Twenty-ninth, A.D. 1656. It is sown a naturall, it is raised a spirituall, body; for this corruptible must put on incorruption; so when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, death is swallowed up in victory. 1 Cor. chap. xv. verse xlv. liii. liv."

Some of the old oak doors of the pews have ancient dates carved on them, shewing that they formed part of the original structure. The most ancient is that on the door of the spacious

---

\* It may be mentioned here that a number of small endowments, left by individuals early in the 18th century, for the benefit partly of the minister of the chapel and partly of the poor of Toxteth Park, and amounting in all to about £12 per annum, were withdrawn from the Park chapel about the year 1827, and for some years altogether alienated from the locality. Recently the last surviving trustee of these endowments has discovered them and restored them to Toxteth Park, the proceeds being now applied, by direction of the Judge of the Liverpool County Court (authorized by the Charity Commissioners to decide), for the benefit of the Independent chapel and the Trinity Presbyterian church (in connection with the Kirk of Scotland) now existing in the same neighbourhood. The deeds were worded in the terms of the Toleration Act, as the law then made necessary (prescribing adherence to the doctrinal Articles of the Church of England), which took the matter out of the scope of the Dissenters' Chapels Act.

† Not improbably the very person with whom Richard Mather lodged when schoolmaster, and to whom he owed his conversion to God. See above, p. 347.

pew of the Mather family, adjoining the pulpit on the preacher's right. On this door is carved D 1650 M, the initials standing, it is believed, for Daniel Mather, a name borne by a recently deceased member of the family. The floor of the pew is the old family vault. On the wall has been placed a handsomely-mounted and decorated brass, with this inscription:

"Near this wall rest the remains of several generations of an ancient family of yeomanry, named Mather, who were settled in Toxteth Park as early as the reign of Queen Elizabeth. They were distinguished by many virtues and by strong religious feeling, and were among the fairest specimens of those who in former times were called Puritans. Not least so was their representative, Daniel Mather, a member of this congregation, born 6 of Oct., 1723; died 30 of June, 1782: Isabel, his excellent wife, daughter of Edward Turner, of Grange, in Cartmel, born 9 of October, 1723, and died 15 of Dec., 1801, is also here interred. They had 9 children, of whom Ann, the last in the family laid in this grave, was born 29 of April, 1762, and died 22 of August, 1826. Let this brass also bear the name of Sarah, the youngest of these children. She was born in the ancient house of the family, and there died on the 2d of April, 1850, at the age of 80, being the oldest member of this congregation, and was interred at the chapel in Renshaw Street, in Liverpool; where rest also her sisters, Elizabeth, Mary and Hannah,\* with her brother, Thomas Mather, of Mount Pleasant, in Liverpool, whose 2d son, John Mather, has here placed this tablet, in grateful remembrance of these his worthy Nonconforming ancestors, A.D. 1852."

On the same wall, on the preacher's left, is a marble tablet erected by Dr. Dobson, a Liverpool physician and author, to the memory of his daughter, with the following Latin inscription, which has been much admired, both for the tenderness and beauty of the sentiment and the purity and elegance of the Latinity:

"Abiit  
Dilecta mea filia  
Elisa!  
Pulchra, Jucunda, Benigna,  
Mea Filia abiit!  
Ingenua perquam et perquam acuta  
Bonis artibus et studiis honestis ornata  
Sancta et Religiosa  
Mea Filia abiit!  
Vale, mea Elisa, vale!  
Te diu desiderandam luget pater:  
Desiderandam, sed, Deo Optimo gratias, non amissam:  
Nam veniet felicior ætas  
Quando iterum, mea filia, te aspiciam,  
Et tecum sempiternæ vivam.  
Matthæus Dobson, caræ, dulci et beatæ suæ Elisæ,  
Quæ annos Septendecim nata,  
Et A.D. 1778  
In cælum placide migravit."

Several other marble tablets adorn the walls, in memory of former members of the congregation, two having been added within the last few years, one in memory of the late Joseph Brooks Yates, Esq., and the other in memory of Mr. Thomas Brown, both simple in their inscriptions, but of beautiful design and workmanship.

\* Another sister, Jane, was mother to the late Thomas Thornely, Esq., whose memoir appears in these pages.



In former days the quiet, rural burial-ground of the Park Chapel was the last resting-place of the most distinguished Nonconformist families in the neighbourhood, including the names of Mather, Whitfield, Aspinwall, Angier, Mercer, Andrews, Kenyon, Brooks (father of the late Archdeacon of Liverpool, the Rev. Jonathan Brooks), the Rev. John Yates and many others. About twenty years ago, the late Richard Vaughan Yates, Esq., purchased a considerable piece of adjoining land and laid it out as a garden cemetery, including a range of vaults, covered by a corridor, with open arches, in one of which his own remains are now laid, surmounted by a marble slab, erected by his sisters, with the following most appropriate inscription, composed principally by the Rev. J. H. Thom:

"Sacred to the Memory  
of

RICHARD VAUGHAN YATES,

Third son of the late Rev. John Yates.

"He held nothing as his own, but, in stewardship to God, devoted his time, his means and himself, to a conscientious self-discipline and to the happiness and improvement of man.

"Touched by the meekness and gentleness of Christ, he was never weary of well-doing, but, in the simplicity of an humble, cheerful and childlike heart, pursued his faithful way, unheeding the judgments of the world.

"With firm attachment to his views of Christian truth, he blended universal charity; and whilst, as a citizen and magistrate, he shrank from no civic strife on behalf of just laws and free institutions, he better loved the promise of peace on earth and goodwill to men.

"Monuments of his benevolence remain. In the Harrington School he taught weekly the children of the poor. In the Liverpool Institute he contributed munificently to the instruction of all classes. He gave the Prince's Park for the enjoyment of the people.

"Whilst exercising the largest public spirit, he freely ministered to private sorrow. Not willingly would he let his left hand know what his right hand was doing. But his goodness could not be hid, and he found the honour that he did not seek.

"Born August 4th, 1785. Died November 30th, 1856."

The cemetery which he laid out has subsequently been purchased from his widow by friends of the chapel, and vested in trustees to be used as a burial-place for the several congregations; so that, the Renshaw-Street ground being now closed by law except for a few surviving relatives of persons already interred, the Park cemetery has resumed its ancient importance. Among the Liverpool worthies whose remains lie near those of Mr. Yates, may be mentioned the late Samuel Holland, John Cropper, Christopher and James Rawdon, William Mather, George Holt, Richard Rathbone, Thomas Harvey and John Finch.

At the same time that Mr. R. V. Yates laid out the additional cemetery, the chapel was slightly enlarged and improved by the removal of the old school-house adjoining and the erection of a new front. Within the last two years the whole has undergone a thorough internal repair; so that, though the modest little building with its simple belfry (for it has the rare distinction of

a bell) now looks somewhat incongruous with the pretentious suburb of Liverpool which has invaded its precincts (great changes having taken place since its bell summoned farmers from their quiet fields), its green and bowery burial-ground is still renewed from year to year by the ever-fresh influences of Nature, and its interior presents a pleasing character of its own, not unsuitable to a place where those who assemble come to forget the passing world with its busy cares, and to worship the ever-living and unchanging God, in the soothing faith that all the departed still live unto Him.

---

## MEMOIR OF THE LATE THOMAS THORNELY, ESQ.

THE life and character of this truly estimable and useful man present many points of instructive interest, not merely to those to whom he is endeared by the affectionate remembrance of personal knowledge, but also to all who would learn betimes the true principles of genuine and honourable success in whatever sphere of duty the Providence of God may place them. By the kind help of his relatives and other friends, we hope to be able to place succinctly before our readers the main features and lessons of his life.

Mr. THORNELY was born on the 1st of April, 1781, in Lord Street, Liverpool, where his father carried on business for many years as a woollen draper. His father was one of the old Presbyterian family of Thornely, at Hyde, in Cheshire, and his mother belonged to a still more noted family in the annals of Presbyterian Dissent, the Mathers, of Toxteth Park. When he was about nine years old, he was placed at school with the Rev. Bristowe Cooper, the minister of Hyde chapel (immediately preceding the Rev. James Brooks), to which fact he made affectionate reference when presiding at the dinner on occasion of the opening of the new chapel at Gee Cross, nearly sixty years later, in 1848. He no doubt received a sound commercial education, but with no pretension to finished classical training; yet by self-culture and practical experience he became a writer of much force and clearness of expression; and his letters and circulars were highly valued among the commercial circles of New York. When he became a candidate for Parliamentary honours, his addresses were selected by the publications of the day as among the best that were issued at the general election of 1832. At the close of his school education, he was apprenticed to the mercantile firm of Messrs. Rathbone,\* Hughes and Duncan, having for fellow-ap-

---

\* Father of the present William Rathbone, Esq., of Greenbank, near Liverpool.

prentices two of his attached friends through life, the late Thos. Bolton, Esq. (of whom an obituary notice appeared only in the last No. of the *Christian Reformer*), and John Ashton Yates, Esq., who still survives. In the year 1802, Mr. Thornely became junior partner in the new firm of Messrs. Martin, Hope and Thornely, doing business chiefly with the United States of America; and in the year 1805 he went to America to represent the firm as resident partner in New York. Here he remained five years, forming many valuable friendships which furnished him with interesting recollections in after life, and inspiring general esteem and confidence by his character and conduct. We believe that one of his political opponents at a subsequent Liverpool election, spoke of him from personal knowledge at this period, saying that he remembered him as one of a number of young English merchants at that time resident in New York, and that he was even then looked upon with great respect, and had considerable influence, not only among his own countrymen, but also with the native merchants of New York and the American public in general; and that he used that influence very effectively in the promotion of peace and good feeling between his own countrymen and the people of the United States at a critical and sensitive period in their international relations. It was at this period, doubtless, that Mr. Thornely first made acquaintance with Dr. Channing, Dr. Freeman, Dr. Greenwood, Mr. Ware, Mr. Furness, Judge Story and others, whose names are now widely honoured as household words. On his return from America in 1810, he took much interest in public affairs and in all matters connected with civil, religious and commercial freedom. In the year 1811, a series of able letters, signed "Mercator," appeared in the then recently established *Liverpool Mercury*, in condemnation of the celebrated Orders in Council by which the British Government designed to retaliate the Berlin and Milan Decrees of the Emperor Napoleon; which Orders and Decrees were considered so insulting and injurious by the Government of the United States, that they laid an embargo upon the shipping, prohibiting all commercial intercourse with either England or France so long as they remained in force. These letters have been attributed to Mr. Thornely, and, whether he wrote them or not, he took the greatest interest in the subject. A requisition to the Mayor of Liverpool, Mr. John Bourne, to call a meeting on the subject, was signed by William Rathbone, Thomas Booth, Thomas Bolton, Thomas Freme, David Hodgson, Thomas Cropper, Thomas Mather, Thomas Thornely and others. The Mayor not only refused to call a meeting, but interfered to prevent a meeting projected independently of him. Mr. Thornely was chosen Secretary to the Managing Committee of the Deputations sent up to London to remonstrate with the Government, thus having the onerous duty of collecting and arranging the



mass of important evidence which was submitted to the Parliamentary Committee, and subsequently laid before the House of Commons by Mr. Brougham with so much skill and effect that the Government were compelled to give way, and the Orders in Council were forthwith rescinded, though not in time to prevent a declaration of war against Great Britain by the United States. It was while Mr. Thornely was in London on this important errand, which occupied him for several months, that he happened to be near enough to the lobby of the House of Commons, on the 11th of May, 1812, to hear the report of the pistol with which Mr. Percival was shot. At an important public meeting held at the Golden Lion, Dale Street, Liverpool, after the rescinding of the Orders in Council, a piece of plate was voted to Mr. Thornely for his valuable services, which testimonial, however, he declined to receive, thus early exemplifying the disinterested manner in which throughout life he freely gave his public services. Shortly after this year, the mercantile firm to which he originally belonged was dissolved, and he formed a partnership with his only brother, under the firm of Thomas and John D. Thornely, which partnership continued until he finally retired from business in 1839. Such was the confidence placed in his character and judgment that he frequently went to London on deputations to Government from the merchants of Liverpool, and took an honourable part in many public meetings called to promote the cause of civil and religious liberty. He entered zealously into the agitation which preceded the passing of the Reform Bill, and was one of the earliest advocates of the repeal of the Corn Laws. He was also in favour of vote by ballot and a shorter duration of Parliament; but though thus identified with the most advanced views of the Liberal party, his character was even then marked by that sound and cautious judgment which was remarkably blended in him with freedom from prejudice and prompt sagacity. Before retiring from business he paid two more visits to the United States, thus adding to his store of knowledge on commercial subjects, and renewing those relations of friendly intercourse with eminent American citizens and divines, which tended greatly to enlarge and enlighten his judgment on social, moral and religious questions.

In the year 1830 took place the noted contest for the representation of Liverpool between Ewart and Denison, with its enormous expenditure on both sides. Soon after the unseating of the successful candidate, because of "gross bribery, treating and corruption," a dissolution of Parliament ensued, when, on a new election, Messrs. Ewart and Denison were returned by a large majority over General Gascoyne. Mr. Denison (the present Speaker of the House of Commons) having been also returned for the northern division of the county of Nottingham, and electing to sit for that division, a vacancy again occurred in

the representation of Liverpool, when the Reform party agreed to bring forward Mr. Thornely in opposition to Lord Sandon, the Conservative candidate. Mr. Thornely being summoned from 'Change in accordance with the resolution of the meeting, at once assented to become the Liberal candidate, adding that, in the event of being elected, he would perform his duties faithfully and diligently, attending the House as regularly as the Speaker himself; and as during the recess he would be found on the Exchange among his constituents, he would be so thoroughly informed of their wants and wishes as to relieve them from the trouble and inconvenience of sending deputations to London to instruct their representatives. His subsequent career as Member for Wolverhampton proved that these were not empty words. As the constituency then consisted entirely of the old freemen, however, Mr. Thornely was nominated more with reference to the future than with any hope of being successful on that occasion; and when, after a few hours, he had polled only 670 votes out of nearly 2200, he retired from the contest. The following is the address issued by him at this election :

"TO THE ELECTORS OF LIVERPOOL.

"Gentlemen,—Although I have been solicited by several of my friends, it is not without some hesitation that I announce to you that it is my intention to offer myself, at the ensuing election, as a Candidate for the honour of representing you in Parliament. I feel impelled to make this declaration, because I believe that negociations are now in progress for bringing among us individuals who are totally unacquainted with our local interests, and who, if elected on the present occasion, would unquestionably expect to be returned hereafter. To me it does appear that, keeping in view those great principles by which the choice of electors ought unquestionably to be guided, there would be the greatest advantage in returning to Parliament at least one Member who, educated in the midst of this great commercial community, would carry with him to Parliament a knowledge of its interests and its wants.

"For myself, I come forward the decided friend of PARLIAMENTARY REFORM, and of that great measure which has been already introduced to Parliament by the present enlightened Administration. I come forward as the friend of Education, anxious for its benefits to be diffused in every part of the British dominions. I come forward as the friend of Peace with foreign nations, and good Government and Economy at home.

"I am the enemy of Commercial Monopolies, especially of that iniquitous Charter by which we are deprived of commercial intercourse with China; and I am of opinion that our Corn Laws should be modified, so that our manufacturers should be always at liberty to exchange the produce of their industry for the corn of other countries, freely admitted here at a moderate duty.

"If then, Gentlemen, these are the principles which you desire your Representative to possess, you have only to decide whether you will intrust the power of advocating them into my hands. I can at least assure you, that the habits of industry which I have acquired as a

Liverpool Merchant shall not be wanting in the promotion of the public good.

“I have the honour to be, Gentlemen, your obedient servant,  
“Liverpool, 25th May, 1831.”  
THO. THORNELY.”

In the following year, 1832, after the passing of the Reform Bill, there was a general election, when the registered householders were permitted for the first time to vote in the election of Members of Parliament. The Conservatives nominated Lord Sandon and Sir Howard Douglas; the Liberals, Mr. William Ewart and Mr. Thornely. A deputation, with Colonel Williams, the Chairman of the meeting, at their head, waited upon Mr. Thornely with a requisition, signed by no less than 1720 names. Mr. Thornely replied in the following terms:

“I receive with gratitude and with pride the requisition which you have had the kindness to present to me, and which, though signed by so great a number of the electors of Liverpool, it is gratifying to me to be informed did not originate among my personal friends, but was commenced by zealous and independent reformers, with many of whom I was not even personally acquainted. I have abstained from coming forward as a candidate, partly on account of the great responsibility of the situation of a Member of Parliament, and also because I have thought that it was rather the part of the electors to select their representative, than for the candidate to offer himself for the public choice. The requisition which I now receive, subscribed by so many of my fellow-townsmen, at once fixes my determination; and I beg to announce to you, Gentlemen, that I shall immediately take the most public mode of offering myself as a candidate for the honour of representing this town in Parliament. Should the exertions of the electors secure my return, I can truly say that I shall enter upon my duties without any personal or selfish object in view, and shall steadily endeavour to promote every measure calculated to advance the public good. I beg to offer you, Gentlemen, my sincerest acknowledgments for the honour you have done me in placing the requisition in my hands.”

We append the principal passages from the full and elaborate address which he issued on this occasion to the electors:

“Called upon by a requisition so numerously and respectably signed, I no longer hesitate to declare that, if elected one of your Members, I will withdraw from every other pursuit, and devote my whole time and energies faithfully to fulfil the duties to which I may be called.

“\* \* \* I have always been a friend of Parliamentary Reform, and, in addition to the great measure already accomplished, I trust that the duration of Parliaments will be shortened, so that the elections may be triennial, whereby the people will have a greater control over their representatives, and the House of Commons will more faithfully embody the tone and character of public opinion. I have always been favourable to the Vote by Ballot, and I shall be much mistaken if the ensuing elections do not demonstrate the necessity of resorting to that measure.

“\* \* \* I consider it essential that our Corn Laws should be repealed, and that a fixed, moderate duty should be laid on the importation of foreign corn. \* \* \* To increase the commerce of the country, by the



gradual removal of such other restrictions as impede the freedom of trade, ought to be the constant aim of an enlightened Government; and the commercial protection to be established should be the protection of the whole community against the efforts of commercial monopolists.

"In early life my opinions were strongly opposed to the African Slave Trade: I am, in the present day, equally opposed to Negro slavery; and \* \* \* I confess that I see no other course that can be pursued than an emancipation of the Negroes as early as shall be consistent with the personal safety of all parties concerned; and if it shall appear that a system of free labour cannot be introduced without loss to the planter, then I am of opinion that a just and reasonable compensation ought to be afforded to him.

"The charters which regulate the municipal proceedings of our corporate towns should be revised. It is an absurdity that the enormous income of the Corporation of Liverpool, with its extensive patronage, should be in the hands of forty-one self-elected individuals. I trust that a general Act of Parliament will be passed to supersede the existing charters, and especially to provide that the Common Council shall be chosen to serve for a limited period by the electors of each town.

"Looking forward with increasing solicitude to the means of improving the condition of society in every part of the British dominions, it is essential that we should have a National System of Education, and thus provide for the future against that state of ignorance and degradation into which a large proportion is now sunk. In connection with this subject, it is most important that all taxes that tend to limit the diffusion of knowledge should be repealed at the earliest possible period.

"I have been informed that it is objected to me that I am not a member of the Church of England. It is perfectly true that I am one of that great body, the Dissenters of Great Britain, who build their own places of worship and pay for them,—who elect their own ministers and support them; and on the subject of my own religious opinions, as I have ever been in reference to others the warm friend of religious liberty, and, I believe, have joined in every petition that has been presented from this town in favour of Catholic Emancipation, so in my own case I give you this assurance, that no hope of public favour, no fear of public displeasure, shall ever induce me to flinch from that great principle of Protestant Dissent, the right of individual judgment in matters of religion.

"\* \* \* If by your exertions I should become a Member of the Reformed Parliament, I pledge myself to use every effort in my power to assist in carrying into effect all those great measures which have yet to be brought forward to advance the good of our country."

This pledge, though in connection with another constituency, Mr. Thornely fully redeemed; and it is remarkable that he assisted to carry out, in some instances more than carry out (with the single exception of triennial Parliaments, as to which we believe his views underwent some modification), every one of the measures thus indicated as essentially-needed reforms.

A crowded meeting of Mr. Thornely's friends was held in the Liver Theatre, Mr. Rathbone in the chair, when able speeches were delivered by Mr. Blackburn and Mr. Egerton Smith (among

others), the latter relating a humorous and telling anecdote of Andrew Marvell, to whom he compared Mr. Thornely in respect of thorough honesty and unassailable disinterestedness of purpose. Mr. Thornely addressed an assembly of three thousand persons in Clayton Square from the window of the Union Hotel, entering at large into his political views. In the course of his speech he said :

“Do you ask me if I have made up my mind about the Corn Laws? Undoubtedly I have. I consider abundance as one of the great blessings of Providence, and I think it wicked in man to attempt to impede the blessings of Providence. A reformed Parliament will do that for you which a corrupt Parliament would not; it will liberate you from the odious monopoly of corn.” “If I am returned to Parliament, there is no subject that I shall be more anxious to promote than the early emancipation of the Negro.” “If you honour me by making me one of the Members of your choice, I will never deceive you. I will promote, to the utmost of my power, economy in every department of the State; I will strive to increase the commerce of the country by sweeping away all impediments; and I will do all in my power to acquit myself worthily of the great honour which you bestow upon me.”

At the nomination, where Mr. Thornely was no doubt looked upon as an extreme Radical, the crowd, which had listened with vehement applause to Mr. Ewart, compelled the other candidates to address themselves within the hustings, and Mr. Thornely was long in obtaining a hearing at all, and then only in detached sentences. He was proposed and seconded by Mr. Rathbone and Mr. Blackburn. At that time the polling at borough elections extended over two days. The result of the first day's polling was a large majority in favour of both the Liberal candidates, the householders polling promptly and zealously for the representatives of the party through which they were enabled for the first time to exercise the right of voting. On the second day, however, the freemen (who did not relish the new mode of voting) were brought up in large numbers, and at the final close of the poll Lord Sandon defeated Mr. Thornely by the small number of 164 votes, Mr. Ewart being at the head and Sir Howard Douglas far in the rear. The total number polled for Mr. Thornely was 4096. Such was the excitement of feeling created, that it was deemed prudent to forego the ceremony of chairing the Members, which had up to that time been the custom. We cannot help regretting that Mr. Thornely did not succeed in obtaining the honour of representing his native town, which he thus so narrowly missed. Judging from the experience of his actual constituency, we cannot help thinking that, had he been returned, he would have gained the confidence and regard of all parties in Liverpool, as he did at Wolverhampton; and that, when once the electors had made trial of his merits, they would never have let him go. Useful and important as was his

actual career, it would have been a still greater service if he could have united the constituency of the second port in the empire in favour of civil, religious and commercial freedom, giving the weighty sanction of Liverpool to his own upright and enlightened views. Looking back on the political history of England for the last half century, we certainly cannot envy the feelings of a thoughtful and candid Tory (if such there be), as he reflects in how many instances during that period his party fiercely and blindly struggled to preserve what are now confessed to have been ignorant and pernicious errors, and to prevent what are now acknowledged to be useful and even indispensable reforms. But to return to Mr. Thornely. Although not quite successful in Liverpool, the manner in which he contested the election, and the full and free expression of his liberal and enlightened views, drew to him the attention of other constituencies; and before the general election in 1835, he accepted an invitation from the electors of Wolverhampton to become a candidate for that important borough (one of the fruits of the Reform Act), in which, we believe, he had not at the time a single personal acquaintance. The contest was not a severe one, and Mr. Thornely became Member for that important town in conjunction with the Hon. C. P. Villiers, so long the prominent and persistent advocate of the repeal of the Corn Laws,—continuing to represent the same borough, together with the same colleague, to the close of his public life nearly a quarter of a century later,—at each succeeding general election no opposition, with one paltry exception, being offered to his return. With regard to his relation to the borough between which and himself there was this enduring and strengthening connection, we append an extract from the *Wolverhampton Chronicle*, published subsequently to his death:

“Our old Representative has long outlived any feeling of party, or any of the heats arising from triumph or from defeat, among even those who originally supported or opposed his election, who must themselves now almost belong to a past generation; and in the minds of the far more numerous present he is only associated as the kind, honest and benignant old man, always ready to afford his assistance to everything connected with the borough which he represented, or to its inhabitants, whom he regarded with so friendly an interest. \* \* \* We may say with truth of him, that no man was ever less boastful: modest, sincere, honest and considerate for others, he gradually won the respect of all who came in contact with him; and this respect was ever enlarging the circle of its boundaries, till it at length embraced the whole of the borough, without distinction of party or of politics; and at the time of his retirement there was, perhaps, no Member of the House of Commons who in so emphatic and complete a manner might be said to represent his borough as did Thomas Thornely the borough of Wolverhampton.”

We also append the principal portion of an excellent and feeling letter with which we have been furnished, from the Rev. Stephenson Hunter, of Carmarthen, formerly minister of the



Presbyterian chapel at Wolverhampton, between whom and Mr. Thornely there existed a deep mutual regard :

“Mr. Thornely’s life and services, uniformly beautiful and good, yet present few salient points adapted to give interest to a biography. No intelligent spectator of the progress of public opinion and political action in Wolverhampton could fail to be sensible of the immense advantage conferred on that town, in respect of both, by our late excellent friend. The constituency which he served so long and so faithfully, is, and has long been, one of the most respectable in the kingdom for intelligence and political purity. Some tendencies to violence which appeared there before Mr. Thornely’s first election, never appeared afterwards. His calm and truthful words convinced his audiences without inflaming any evil passion, and his upright and consistent life presented no available ground of attack, even to those who were politically opposed to him.

“When he visited his constituents periodically, he made no distinction, in his personal attentions to them, between supporters and opponents at the hustings; and when any of them required his advice or assistance elsewhere, these were offered with the same kind and cordial impartiality. Though at first elected by a party, it was soon generally and strongly felt that in every important respect he was an excellent Representative of the whole constituency. All felt the growing advantage, national as well as individual, of the policy which he advocated and supported; nor was it easy to determine whether it was by Whig or Tory that his presence among his constituents was most cordially welcomed.

“The simplicity and integrity of character which gained for Mr. Thornely the high standing which he secured in the House of Commons, was remarkably displayed at his first election. There was a contest for the representation which was expected to be very severe; and the doubtful result was rendered still more doubtful to his friends by the circumstance that he was not only a Dissenter, but an Unitarian. The election was to take place on a Monday, and many of his friends advised him to spend the preceding Sunday in Liverpool, in order that his religious views might not be made unnecessarily conspicuous, and one more obstacle be thus thrown in the way of his return. He rejected this timid counsel, however, absolutely and at once, resolved to practise no concealment whatever of his religious convictions more than of his political opinions, for any purpose whatever. His fidelity to principle had its reward in being appreciated even by his political opponents, while it did not even temporarily stand in the way of his success. Having attended the services in the Unitarian chapel on the Sunday, he was on the Monday returned to the House of Commons as one of the Members for Wolverhampton by a commanding majority.

“He found the Unitarian chapel in the town which he so well represented, encumbered with a heavy debt, which by his own liberality and that of some of his friends was soon liquidated. Without the slightest tendency to intolerance in regard to the religious convictions of others, he made it a matter of conscience to give a zealous and consistent support to his own. When the lapse of a few years had given to his constituency sufficient opportunity to know Mr. Thornely’s character and to understand his political principles, his return was for the most part unopposed. A paltry and hopeless attempt at opposition was made

at his last election, but it did no more than throw a passing cloud over the conclusion of a long and honourable career of public service and favour. And when his final resignation of his seat was tendered, and only of necessity accepted, that brief and only seeming change of public approbation was quite forgotten in the public and unanimous expression of esteem, admiration and gratitude, which his resignation elicited."

This will perhaps be the most appropriate place in which to introduce the farewell address in which Mr. Thornely took leave of his constituents, when compelled by the infirmities of advancing age to retire from public life:

"TO THE ELECTORS OF THE BOROUGH OF WOLVERHAMPTON, INCLUDING BILSTON, WILLENHALL, WEDNESFIELD AND SEDGLEY.

"Gentlemen,—As a dissolution of Parliament will shortly take place, it becomes my duty to announce to you that, from the failing state of my health, it is not my intention to offer myself for re-election.

"It is now more than twenty-four years since I and my Rt. Honourable Colleague were first chosen by you to be your Representatives in the House of Commons.

"Since our first election in 1835, we have represented you continuously, and on the last four occasions we have been re-elected without opposition.

"Let me add, that there is not in the kingdom any other large or independent constituency, returning two Members to Parliament, which during the same period has been represented by the same two Members.

"These are most significant facts. They shew, I trust, that there has been confidence on your part; and, for myself, I can assure you that they quicken my deep sense of the honour I have enjoyed at your hands, and add to the pain I feel in now taking leave of you.

"The period during which it has been my privilege to be one of your Representatives has been a most conspicuous one in our history; and, through your kindness, I have been able to give my zealous support to the many excellent measures which have followed the Reform Act of 1832, and have contributed so largely to our country's good.

"Without entering at length into an enumeration, I may mention those important measures in which you have always taken so lively an interest,—I mean the Repeal of the Corn Laws and the adoption of the principles of Free Trade. Some disappointment has indeed been expressed that other nations have not more generally imitated our Free Trade policy; but, in the words of Mr. Roebuck, I would ask, 'Why should we practise folly because other nations lack wisdom?'

"The establishment of cheap Postage and of other Postal Reforms has contributed materially to the welfare of all classes in the country.

"Large measures of Law Reform have been carried out, and additional ones are now under consideration.

"The Jews have been admitted to Parliament, and the principles of Civil and Religious Liberty appear at length fully recognized, and, I trust, will always continue to be the guide of our legislators.

"I esteem it a privilege that, during my political life, I have shared the responsibilities of my position with my excellent Colleague, and have invariably enjoyed the benefit of his abilities and kind advice. I hope and trust he may long continue to represent you in Parliament.

"And now, Gentlemen, I must say farewell.

"With the best wishes for the prosperity of your borough, and with my most friendly regards to every individual in your constituency,

"I have the honour to remain, Gentlemen, your obliged  
and faithful servant,

THOMAS THORNELY."

"London, 24, Regent Street, 5th April, 1859."

Even in the short period that has intervened since the publication of the above address, Mr. Thornely has had the satisfaction of witnessing the partial fulfilment of one of its aspirations in the adoption and in the signal results of the French Commercial Treaty; though, in another direction, the convulsion of civil war by which the United States are torn (a country endeared to him by so many associations of friendly intercourse), must have been to him a source of anxious and painful interest during his final months of weakness and decay.

Mr. Thornely was first elected in January, 1835, and took his seat on the 19th of February, giving his first vote that night, in the election of Speaker, for Mr. Abercromby, who was chosen by a majority of ten over Sir C. Manners Sutton in a House of 622 Members. We hardly need remind our readers of the importance of the period in Parliamentary history during which Mr. Thornely took his faithful part. Whatever the future may have in store, few past periods of the same length have been equally prolific in political and social progress.

Mr. Thornely having always been a staunch and intelligent advocate of the policy of Free Trade, naturally took deep interest in the long and difficult struggle for the repeal of the Corn Laws and the removal of all other mistaken and iniquitous restrictions. He was a member of the very important Committee on Import Duties appointed in 1840, the evidence taken before which, of J. Deacon Hume and others, decided Sir Robert Peel in his earlier measures for repealing and reducing those duties. Mr. Thornely from the first condemned the sliding scale of duties on imports of corn, by which the duty was raised or lowered inversely as the price in the markets fell or rose, rendering the speculations of the importer most hazardous and uncertain, besides injuring the consumer by the artificial scarcity maintained. Often when Sir Robert Peel was accustomed, session after session, to dilate with his specious rhetoric on the blessings and beauties of the sliding scale, Mr. Thornely was heard to say in conversation, "If Peel would take up the repeal of the Corn Laws, he would be the first man of the day." When, after Sir Robert Peel had at length yielded to the overpowering force of evidence and argument brought to bear upon him by Mr. Cobden and his coadjutors, and, bravely casting aside his party ties and prejudices, suffered himself, as pilot of the State, to be borne on the triumphant tide into the harbour of Free Trade, and Mr. Thornely



was paying his fourth and final visit to the United States in 1842, accompanied by his eldest nephew, he lost no opportunity of urging upon the Americans, whether persons in office, manufacturers or merchants, the justice and the advantages of the free-trade measures which Sir Robert Peel had recently carried.

In the year 1839, his father, who had retired from business and taken up his residence with Mr. Thornely and his sister, died, having almost completed his 95th year. Mr. Thornely often spoke of him as "the most upright of men;" and this characteristic has happily been reproduced in the succeeding generations. While thus touching on the subject of his domestic relations, we may add that in the year 1848 he lost his former partner and only brother, John D. Thornely, to whom he was much attached, and whose death he felt very deeply. From that time, he became almost as a father to his brother's numerous children; and though himself never married, yet in his devoted affection to the sister who lived with him, and in his kindly supervision of the orphaned family, he virtually fulfilled a wide range of domestic duties.

One subject which occupied much of Mr. Thornely's interest and attention, a subject peculiarly fit to be gratefully referred to in these pages, was the Dissenters' Chapels Bill, by which all the old meeting-houses, burial-grounds and endowments of the English Presbyterians were preserved from alienation to the uses of "orthodox" strangers, in consequence of the final judgment in the celebrated suit of the Lady Hewley Charity. The principle of law by which congregations that had gradually adopted Unitarian views of Christianity lost all title to their religious property, simply from the fact that prior to a recent date it was illegal to impugn the doctrine of the Trinity, and therefore that the language of all wills and deeds must be interpreted in a sense legal *at the time*, was felt to be so hard and iniquitous in its operation, that the leading men of all parties, in both Houses of Parliament, when made acquainted with the true bearings of the question, threw themselves with admirable generosity into the cause of the oppressed few, in many cases at great risk to their popularity with their orthodox Dissenting constituents. But, as a preliminary measure, it was necessary to have a constant and hard-working Committee to promote petitions, prepare evidence, and wait upon Members; and to this Committee Mr. Thornely rendered invaluable aid by his knowledge of men and Parliamentary business, his judicious counsel, and, above all, by his own hearty and active co-operation. The value of his aid was rather felt in its results than prominently seen or distinctly recognized; for it was one of Mr. Thornely's characteristics to be utterly devoid of vanity and self-glorification. So long as the end in view was promoted, it never entered into his mind to consider whether due credit was accruing to himself. He had

none of the fidgetty misgivings of a vain and exacting man, always hankering after personal prominence, and pettishly imagining that his own merits are not duly recognized. He simply gave himself up to the cause which approved itself to his judgment, without any selfish consideration that the cause should do something for him in return. As generally happens, indeed, he found the honour that he did not seek. It was felt at the time, and it has perhaps been still more distinctly felt in recollection since his removal, that his constant and ready co-operation, calm judgment, and cheerful, steady perseverance, were of real and inestimable value. In the words of Mr. Charles F. Tagart, who was officially connected with the Committee for promoting the Bill, "He rendered undoubtedly very valuable and cordial aid to its promoters, but so unobtrusively, that, on looking over the general *resumé* of the Committee's labours, drawn up by myself and revised by Mr. Field on the dissolution of that body, I do not find any record of an occasion on which he took a prominent part, nor was any *special* vote of thanks made to him for his services. I, however, well remember that he was always ready to attend any call made upon him for specific services, such as to introduce or accompany deputations to the members of the Government and the Legislature; and owing to the general respect and esteem in which he was held, he had great opportunity of obtaining a knowledge of the views and probable course which would be taken by leading men in and out of Parliament, which information was extremely useful to the Committee of the measure. And the Committee had generally the utmost reliance on his sound judgment and hearty sympathy." We happen to remember that Mr. Thornely deliberately checked any conspicuous appearance in the great debate in the House of Commons, of himself or any of the Unitarian Members, who might be supposed to be speaking under the influence of their personal interests and feelings; and we believe he actually pulled down to his seat a less discreet and more impatient friend who was starting up to address the House. Mr. Thornely rightly judged that the arguments would fall with infinitely greater weight upon the House and upon the country if enunciated by impartial statesmen like Sir Robt. Peel, Mr. Gladstone, Sir Wm. Follett, Mr. Macaulay, Mr. Sheil and others, whose great speeches seemed at the time to stun the ignorant and narrow clamours of the "evangelical" Dissenters into astonished silence; and now combine to form a volume of masterly reasoning, knowledge and eloquence, that deserves to be immortal from its intrinsic merits, even when the special topic is forgotten. Referring to this debate in a speech from the chair when presiding at the opening of the new chapel at Gee Cross, July 5, 1848, Mr. Thornely said, "The debate on the subject in the House of Commons called up all the highest talent of the House. Occupying only one night, it was not, as

was frequently the case with 'adjourned debates,' diluted by inferior speeches. It was, in reality, the best debate he had ever heard." It must have been an interesting and impressive interview when Mr. Thornely and the other Unitarian Members waited upon Sir Robert Peel, then Prime Minister, to express to him their sincere acknowledgments of the generous and courageous sense of justice which had led him to risk his popularity with large and determined bodies; while they did him the honour to believe that he would not for a moment imagine that they would therefore in the slightest degree sacrifice their independence, should their judgment lead them in future, as it often had led them in the past, to oppose his general policy.

Mr. Thornely on one occasion took a very active part in a Committee in the House respecting Sunday legislation, and helped to defeat some unwise attempts to make the "*bitter*" observance of the Sabbath more stringently enforced. In the year 1844, when railway companies were compelled to convey third-class passengers on every week-day, Mr. Thornely moved and carried a provision that third-class passengers should have the same privilege on Sundays, and at the same rate of fare, namely, one penny per mile.

His attendance to his Parliamentary duties was most assiduous. For many sessions only two Members, his valued friends Mr. George Duncan and Mr. Joseph Brotherton, were present in more divisions than himself. His influence in Parliament steadily increased. We have seen that he entered the House of Commons as a holder of rather extreme Liberal opinions, but under the influence of experience and of personal knowledge of the working of the great parties in the State, he became one of the steadiest supporters of the Liberal Ministry who conducted the Government. This change, indeed, may have consisted at least as much in the onward movement of the age as in any increased conservatism in him. It was not so much that he moved back as that the age moved on. With scarcely an exception, what were considered extreme views in Mr. Thornely's youth, are now looked upon as either accomplished or essential reforms. Moreover, though a general supporter of the Liberal Ministry, he often gave an independent vote, especially on questions of retrenchment and economy. Many years ago, in the height of the struggle for Free Trade, we remember Mr. Cobden, at a sort of private meeting of Liverpool friends of the movement, eulogize Mr. Thornely and his colleague as most useful Members, who "always voted right and had no crotchets." Mr. Thornely did not often address the House, being a worker rather than a talker; but he acquired great personal influence from his consistency, the regularity of his attendance and the habitual attention that he paid to every matter of business that had claims upon him. We have been told on good authority that when a deputation



from the manufacturing districts once consulted Lord Derby and Lord Stanley about the best mode of proceeding to secure a measure in the House of Commons, Mr. Thornely's name was mentioned by the latter as a gentleman of great influence, whose support should, if possible, be secured. As Chairman of the Committee on Petitions, he was exceedingly useful; and the fairness and good sense with which he administered that part of the business of the House were acknowledged on all sides. Our readers will probably remember how quietly and effectually he put an extinguisher on the empty bravado and shameless quackery of Feargus O'Connor, by his official exposure of the fictitious names and vulgar nonsense which swelled the signatures to that impostor's Monster Petition. We have a personal recollection of the minuteness with which Mr. Thornely discharged his duties as Chairman of this Committee, when he once called the attention of a minister to the fact that two of the signatures to a petition that had been sent up from his congregation were in the same handwriting; an irregularity which, if noticed, would vitiate the petition. It was one of the important duties of this Committee to determine what petitions should be printed. Mr. Thornely was also one of the small Committee for selecting Election Committees, whose delicate office it is to try the validity of disputed returns.

On the meeting of the new Parliament in 1857, Mr. Thornely was requested by Lord Palmerston to second the nomination of the new Speaker, which he did in a sensible speech in deprecation of long and late speeches, "keeping us here out of our beds." We beg to refer our readers to a brief but most interesting notice in the *Unitarian Herald* of May 17, in which an early instance is related of Mr. Thornely's prompt sagacity and energy in inducing Government to abandon the absurdities of the quarantine system; and we cannot refrain from quoting the touching expression of one of "those with whom he may be supposed to have had fewest points of sympathy," speaking of him when years began to tell upon him, "There is not a fast young Member who does not think it an honour to be allowed to help Mr. Thornely into his carriage."

In many respects Mr. Thornely was a model of what it is desirable, as a rule, that a Member of Parliament should be. Not that we would wish to exclude from the House of Commons brilliant eloquence and original genius; but soundness and promptness of judgment, clearness of view, intelligent and unremitting attention to business, great practical experience as a travelled merchant, and, to crown all, inflexible consistency and uprightness of purpose, are qualities indispensable to the safe working and sure guidance of the vessel of the State. Eccentric sons of genius, such as Charles Lamb, might perhaps feel that there could be only "imperfect sympathies" between them and

that more prosaic stamp of mind which is not relieved by the sallies of fancy or the grotesqueness of humour. It may be that we were not sufficiently intimate with him to see into his inner life, but we cannot remember that we ever knew him laugh. Deep and firm as were his personal attachments to relatives and friends, he never appeared to us to be in either extreme of hilarity or depression, but always, if we may use the expression, cheerfully grave, equably and serenely serious. He would never have said, with Sydney Smith, "Now let us talk a little nonsense." But if not often lighted up by the lively play of poetry or humour, he was, on the other hand, devoid of the wayward shortcomings and perverse excesses of eccentric genius. Though as far removed as possible from anything like self-righteous pride, we can hardly think he would feel sympathy with any inability at once to do what the judgment and conscience prescribed. His well-balanced and healthy nature, we imagine, would scarcely be able to comprehend what it was to see and approve the better course and yet to follow the worse. Sincerely humble as he was, he could not, we think, be very deeply touched by the apostolic confession, "To will is present with me; but how to perform that which I will, I find not. For the good that I would, I do not; but the evil which I would not, that I do." This sound and even temperament no doubt contributed to the steadiness of his attachment through life to that form of Christian faith which does not demand the utter vilification of our nature and exclusive reliance on the vicarious merits of Christ. And, on the other hand, it is not too much to claim for that form of faith itself, that to its truthful and wholesome lessons he probably owed important practical influences, contributing in no slight degree to determine the tendency and complexion of his excellent and blameless life. Weighty as were the national affairs which he helped to regulate, and much as he was looked up to by eminent men of all parties, his sincere and deep attachment to Unitarian Christianity seemed rather to increase than to diminish. On his return home, whether for the Easter or the summer recess, he was sure to be in his place in his accustomed house of prayer; and, as it has been remarked in the notice to which we have already referred, "His friends often noted the solicitude with which in a strange town he was accustomed to inquire out the Presbyterian or Unitarian chapel. And in those chance visits, many a little country church knows itself benefited by his sympathy and his purse." He was one of the Vice-presidents of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association and of Manchester New College, and a constant and willing contributor to the funds of every society or institution tending to promote the interests or extend the charities of his own denomination of Christians, besides being ever ready to respond to the deserving claims of educational or charitable efforts in general, and of private, per-

sonal appeals. We have already alluded to the fact that he was invited to preside at the opening of the new chapel at Gee Cross, Hyde, in 1848, which he did most appropriately and feelingly, alluding to his early days in that neighbourhood and to the ancient connection of his family with the old chapel, their names appearing in the original trust-deed. He contrasted the state of the district when the first chapel was built with that at which he spoke, and at the close of his parting address said, "From the place where I now stand, I witness a sight I shall never behold again. I see at the same time the ancient chapel of Hyde, built 140 years ago, and that elegant structure that has been opened this day."\*

Though a stated member of the Renshaw-Street congregation and an attached friend of its respected minister, he maintained kind and friendly relations with the ministers and congregations of Hope Street and Toxteth Park, and took pleasure in exercising towards them, when at home, a cordial and extended hospitality. Nor did his Parliamentary importance diminish his attachment to his native town, though it had not chosen him as its representative. He continued to be a citizen of Liverpool and to take an interest in promoting its welfare. He was one of the original members of the Liverpool Literary and Philosophical Society, which lately celebrated its fiftieth anniversary. He was also one of the founders of the Mechanics' and Apprentices' Library in February, 1824, becoming successively Secretary, Treasurer and President, the Annual Report in 1830 having been drawn up by him. This Library was removed to the Brougham Institute, and the objects at which both aimed, with but slender support, are now much more systematically and splendidly promoted by the Liverpool Institute (of which also Mr. Thornely was a friend from the first) and the Free Public Library, built by the munificence of Mr. William Brown. Mr. Thornely was one of the original proprietors of the Liverpool Athenæum, which was founded by Mr. Roscoe, Dr. Currie and others, in 1798, and which still remains one of the best news-rooms and the best library in the town. His was also one of the names of longest standing on the Commission of the Peace for his native county.

Until a comparatively recent period, his vigour of mind and body remained unimpaired; and, owing in part, no doubt, to his regular and temperate life and his methodical habits of business, and in part to his sound constitution and even temperament, his Parliamentary duties and London hours seemed to agree with him remarkably well, and he was a fine specimen of a hale English gentleman; and when the warnings of mortality at

---

\* The whole proceedings, which were of great interest, may be perused in the *Christian Reformer*, New Series, Vol. IV. (1848) pp. 500—508.



length came rather suddenly upon him, he was, not unnaturally, slow to acknowledge the fact that he must submit to be an invalid. His growing infirmities, however, rendering it impossible for him to continue to give that thorough and unremitting attention to his duties which had always characterized him, in 1859 he retired from Parliament, issuing to his long-attached constituents at Wolverhampton that manly and dignified address, affecting in its simplicity and calmness, which we have already laid before our readers. In the following year, 1860, he paid one more visit to London; but in July of that year he was seized with an increase of weakness which confined him to his room as a confirmed invalid for the remainder of his life, quitting his house only on two occasions, one of them being to give his vote in favour of the Liberal candidate for the third seat allotted to the representation of the southern division of Lancashire. Up to the period just stated, he had been able to continue his unflinching habit through life of attending public worship; and during the twenty-two months of tedious but happily painless confinement, he would still speak hopefully of being "able to go to chapel again." He was not permitted to do this alive, but one of his cherished wishes was gratified in regard to the place of his final repose. The burial-ground attached to Renshaw-Street chapel, in which were the vaults of his family, had been peremptorily closed under the sanitary regulations of the Home Office; but Mr. Thornely, in a special interview with Lord Palmerston, had most earnestly, we believe even affectingly, entreated some relaxation of the rule in favour of himself and a few surviving friends—perhaps the only personal favour he ever asked at the hands of Government. Lord Palmerston, who had shut himself out of his own family vault under the same general regulation, at first, we have been told, did not sympathize with Mr. Thornely's earnestness. Ultimately, however, the rule was relaxed, under certain specified conditions, in favour of surviving near relatives of persons already interred. We have mentioned this fact as (to us) an affecting illustration of the deep and strong feeling which invariably characterized Mr. Thornely's personal attachments and religious associations.

Another wish cherished by him during his days of helpless weakness, was to keep up his old habits of hospitality; and though his voice was reduced to a whisper, his intellect remained clear, and he always took pleasure in the visits of old friends who could talk of old times, or in the innocent presence of young children. Our readers may have seen his name as a contributor to various good objects during his months of decline, and his previously well-principled and self-possessed character now manifested itself in the touching and beautiful aspects of gentle patience, kind courtesy, gratitude to those around him for the services affectionately rendered, and humble and hopeful sub-

mission to his Heavenly Father. After a fresh accession of weakness, from which he did not rally, he expired on Sunday, the 4th of May last, surrounded by his relatives and full of peace, aged 81. In the absence of his friend and pastor, the Rev. J. H. Thom, who had unfortunately been compelled to leave home for the continent for the sake of his health only a few days before, not anticipating that the end was so near, the funeral service was conducted by one who also had the privilege of counting him as a friend of many years' standing, the minister of the Ancient chapel of Toxteth Park. He was interred on the 8th of May, near his fellow-apprentice and constant friend for sixty years, Thomas Bolton, whose funeral had taken place only five weeks before. We append the following extract from the *Liverpool Mercury*:

“On Thursday morning, the remains of the late Thomas Thornely, Esq., were interred in the burial-ground connected with the Unitarian chapel, Renshaw Street. The general respect and esteem entertained for the deceased by his fellow-townsmen were manifested in the large attendance at the obsequies, though, so far as the relatives of the deceased were concerned, it was their desire that the mournful ceremony should be conducted with the strictest privacy. In addition to a number of gentlemen connected with the church with which the deceased was associated, there were many present belonging to other denominations of Christians, anxious to share in the wide-spread feeling of respect shewn to the memory of the departed. Amongst those present were Messrs. William Rathbone, William Brown, James Mulleneux, W. Ridyard, Rev. Dr. Raffles, Rev. S. A. Steinthal, Messrs. T. Avison, T. S. Raffles, D. Paton, P. Rathbone, G. Holt, P. Holt, W. J. Lamport, R. Rowlinson, J. Rowlinson, Thomas Haigh, Timothy Jevons, S. G. Rathbone, H. Booth, A. Stone, E. Fletcher, R. Benn, C. E. Rawlins, Jun., J. Y. Lee, S. Bright, J. Hand, W. Wood, S. T. Hobson, Thomas Thornely, Henry Jevons, &c., &c.

“The funeral *cortège*, which left the residence of the deceased in Mount Street shortly after ten o'clock, consisted of the hearse, two mourning coaches, and seven or eight private carriages, the latter being closed. In the mourning coaches were the seven nephews of the late Mr. Thornely, namely, Messrs. William Thornely, James Thornely, Francis Thornely, John Thornely, Alfred Thornely, Edward Thornely and Charles Thornely; also Mr. Samuel Thornely, a cousin, and Mr. George Jevons, a relative by marriage. Amongst the private carriages were those of Mr. Wm. Brown, Mrs. Harvey, Mrs. Holt, Mr. William Rathbone and Mr. W. Wood.

“The body having been taken into the chapel, the Rev. J. Robberds, minister of the Ancient chapel, Toxteth Park, read in a very impressive manner the usual burial service. He then delivered an appropriate address, as follows: ‘My Christian Friends,—This cannot but be a solemn occasion to us all; but I may surely say that there can be no bitterness in the sorrow even of those to whom he who is gone was nearest and dearest. Every circumstance that can soften and sanctify the contemplation of death is present to us now. Our friend has not

been cut off in the midst of his days; he has fulfilled the allotted measure of fourscore years, and the brief period of declining strength has not been to him a season of labour and sorrow, but of peaceful resignation and tranquil hope. None can point, in his case, to powers unused or to opportunities of good neglected. We may humbly say that he has done the work which the Providence of God gave him to do. It was his lot to fill a useful and important post of duty, and he filled it with steady perseverance, cheerful firmness, unbending integrity and unflinching consistency, 'without haste and without rest,' till the natural decay of his earthly powers compelled him to repose. In the whole range of his relations in life—as an esteemed and beloved brother; as the kind and judicious adviser of a rising generation of relatives who looked up to him as their head; as an honoured and respected member of a wide circle of friends and early associates; as a valued citizen and honourable merchant of this his native town, taking his part manfully, yet temperately, in the cause of freedom and reform, from a time when that cause needed much courage and firmness in its friends; as a benevolent helper of every object of private or social charity; as a consistent adherent of the form of Christian faith which approved itself to his conscientious judgment, but with nothing of the uncharitable exclusiveness of a sectarian spirit; as a faithful, diligent and disinterested servant of his country in the labours of the senate for nearly a quarter of a century, during a most eventful and fruitful period in the world's history—in all these varied and extended relations, I am not aware that, tried by human judgment, he ever swerved from the straightforward integrity of purpose which was the ruling principle of his life. Our Saviour said to his disciples, 'Woe unto you when all men shall speak well of you.' Surely these words could be literally applicable only to the exceptional and critical period when the new and obnoxious faith of his gospel was working a spiritual revolution in the earth, for certainly I never heard that any men spoke otherwise than well of our departed friend, however widely they might differ from the theological or political convictions which he uniformly and steadily professed.

"But this language of eulogy, however natural and spontaneous to the feelings of affectionate survivors, is yet perhaps not that which our friend himself, could he now be consulted, would wish to be made the lesson of this hour. He has now done with earthly interests and mortal concerns, and is looking forward to the heavenly crown. He would rather say—let the lesson of this hour be the transient and perishable nature of all interests and duties that are merely of the earth, earthy. How short seems in retrospect the longest earthly life! Let us be solemnly reminded that all the labours and cares and busy interests of this life are of no real and enduring value save as they help to build up the character of the immortal soul. Let us seek how we may sanctify every earthly duty by doing it as to the Lord. Let us do all things heartily, as to the holy and eternal God, and not unto vain and fallible men. It is impressive and affecting to take leave, one after another, of valued and honoured friends and associates. Let us be reminded by these events to hold fast our heavenly hope, and thus to be truly faithful in the discharge of our earthly duties. When called upon from time to time to suffer bereavement by the will of God, let us commit the keeping of our souls to Him in well-doing, as unto a faithful Creator. And



when we in our turn are called away from the deeds done in the body, may it be ours to receive the sentence promised to all who diligently do their appointed work—‘Well done, good and faithful servants; ye have been faithful over a few things, ye shall be made rulers over many things; enter ye into the joy of your Lord.’

“A suitable prayer closed this portion of the solemn ceremony, and the body, followed by the relatives and friends, was then conveyed to the place of interment at the rear of the chapel. The Rev. Mr. Robberds read the remainder of the service at the grave side, and the mournful proceedings terminated.”

On the following Sunday, the Rev. Charles Wicksteed, who had previously engaged to take Mr. Thom’s place on that day, most appropriately occupied the Renshaw-Street pulpit as an old and well-known friend of the minister and the congregation. We may just remark that Mr. Wicksteed was the preacher at the opening of the new chapel at Gee Cross in 1848, when Mr. Thornely so ably presided at the dinner. We are glad to be able to place before our readers some extracts from his discourse, which will form a fitting conclusion to this Memoir.

Mr. Wicksteed took his text from 1 Peter iii. 4, “Let it be the hidden man of the heart, in that which is not corruptible.” After dwelling upon it as one of the peculiar and beautiful features of the religion of Jesus Christ that “the righteous shall be held in everlasting remembrance,” and illustrating the value of the remembrance of one departed in our estimate of his character as a whole, he felt prompted to ask the natural question, what manner of man it was that had now left them and been held in so much honour, and what lessons his example taught. He then proceeded:

“And here let me express a regret, most natural on my part, as on all of yours, that the duty which I am now attempting to discharge, it has not been possible for your respected minister and friend, and the respected minister and friend of the deceased for thirty years, to discharge in his own tender and delicately discriminating manner. His services in this place, I too well know, are rendered at an imminent risk to his health and strength; and imperative as on these grounds is his absence now, no considerations of personal comfort or safety would have been allowed by him for one moment to interfere with his discharge of this duty, or the expression of his own strong attachment and respect to him whom we have now lost, could he have known that the last severance would take place while he was away.”

After remarking that the time was now come when they were authorized and impelled to say in all sincerity what they felt, he proceeded:

“I think, then, the foundation of this not only general, but, I think I may say, this universal respect and attachment to our departed friend, was, in the language of our text to-day, ‘the hidden man of the heart, in that which is not corruptible.’ His life and character formed an illustration and an example in actual human life of a man quietly and silently beginning with himself the culture of his own mind, the con-

trolling of his own dispositions, the conscientious formation of his own principles and habits—the attention first of all to those duties which were attached to his position in life, which related to himself, to his business, to the wants and interests of the community by which he was immediately surrounded. He was of opinion that

‘A man’s best things are nearest him,  
Lie close about his feet.’

Nor was it

‘—— the distant and the dim  
That he was sick to greet.’

In this way he went on for fifty years quietly and silently, gaining the means of independence, collecting the stores of information and experience afterwards so useful to him, gathering the respect and confidence of his fellow-citizens and of society around him, and finally, with very marked success, devoting his leisure and his attainments to the service of his country.

“This career shews that he was not insensible to nor unambitious of the distinctions attached to high public and private character. But perhaps, in the following out of this ambition, no man ever took a more exact gauge of himself—of his own powers and aptitudes—of what was within his scope and what without it. The consequence of which was, that he was never found out of his place, and never put himself in any position in which he did not command entire respect.

“With a strong though quiet desire for public position and public usefulness, he was entirely free from ostentation. His ambition was never weak or silly, or such as to lead him into false positions. He had a manly confidence in what he could do, and an equally manly knowledge of what he could not do. The consequence was, that you always found him busy with what was within his knowledge and power, and never meddling with things and subjects outside them. And thus it was that this man stood, year after year, in the midst of superior rank, superior talent, superior wealth, superior authority and superior genius, for nearly a quarter of a century, and never lost his own respect or the respect of any one else. For he had the essential elements of all true dignity of character. He never appeared, or tried to appear, other than he was. He never stood where he had not a right to stand. In all places and all circumstances he was himself; and every one that looked upon him knew that what they saw with the outward eye was also ‘the hidden man of the heart, in that which is not corruptible.’

“It was this entire correspondence between the outer and the inner man, this singleness of purpose and incorruptibility of character, which first gained him the confidence of his friends and fellow-townsmen, that afterwards secured to him a position of such pre-eminent respectability in the senate of his country.

“He entered the House of Commons to do his duty in it. He arranged most conscientiously his hours and mode of life, and adopted with admirable good sense the plans by which his health and strength could be made to go through most work. The result was, that in the fatiguing, unostentatious, and often unknown and unappreciated, labour of the Committees, where his knowledge and good sense made him a valuable and welcome counsellor, his usefulness was most marked; and in the assiduity of his constant attendance in the House itself, he was surpassed by, I believe, only two men.



"In examining the division lists, you invariably found him voting, not necessarily with his party, but always with his principles. Sometimes he swelled the numbers of a large and triumphant majority, and sometimes the fingers on your hand would have afforded numerals sufficient to count the minority in which his name appeared. But whether he voted with many or few, with the Ministry or against the Ministry, you always found him—at least so it seems to me on looking back over that quarter of a century—where you expected to find him. For he was never swayed by any side-motives. There were in him none of those sudden and unexpected changes, those startling and unlooked-for positions, which mark the career of many men.

"Personal motives and convenience—a disposition to please or to oblige—caprice of judgment or of temper—never led him to swerve from the course his conscience dictated to him was the best course for the nation and for the people he represented. And in truth, for the most part, the grounds on which he voted were as well known to you as to himself; they might have been written and published straight off his heart, and proclaimed in the daylight of the whole world. For in truth he voted from 'the inner man of the heart, in that which is not corruptible.' And what was remarkable was, that in his case, for twenty-four years, that senseless and fanatical cry on the specialties, or supposed specialties, of his personal religious faith, was either never violently raised, or was kept down in hopeless abeyance by the solid force of his character and the evident Christianity of his life."

After an admirable and forcible passage on the absurdity of distrusting a man because of his honest fidelity to his religious convictions, and on the instructiveness of Mr. Thorneley's example in this respect, the preacher continued:

"I should not like to leave this attempted study of the character of our friend without alluding to one feature more, the constancy of his friendship.

"It is thirty years since I first stood a stranger where I now stand, and saw the eye of his kindly and encouraging attention fixed upon me in that way that always seemed to me to make him appear to take, even in his silent presence, a ministering part in the services of this place. And in the frank and simple greeting which followed, he shewed at once his kindliness and his caution, and also a peculiarity which was very marked in him, I should think amounting to a habit, of ascertaining of strangers not *what* they were or appeared to be, so much as, if possible, *who* they were, and whether, as he would express it, 'they came of a good stock.' The friendship thus commenced, more, I think, from these considerations than any personal ones, and more owing to a link with the past than from any attraction to the present,—though distance separated me from the privilege of his frequent society,—nevertheless seemed to be always gathering a little, and (as I look back upon the interval) chiefly, I think, by his own kind contrivance.

"And this is the impression which I believe must rest upon the minds of many—the fidelity of his friendships. In the business of human life—in the pressingness and the number of the occupations which fill up the time of an active and industrious man—in the absorbingness of special duties and pursuits—in the distances which separate us—it often



happens that we have but small actual intercourse with those who were once our friends, and who, had we continued to live near them or been united by common pursuits, would have been our friends still.

"It may be true that all this time our hearts may not have changed, nor theirs either, and that if circumstances brought us together again, we should find each other just where we were, and, taking up the threads of our intercourse where we had left them, continue weaving the suit of friendship, finding it interrupted and delayed in its progress perhaps, but unbroken in itself. But with Mr. Thornely it was not quite so. He was not quite content with this. Careful in his selection of his friendships, he was careful also to keep them up; and when once formed, 'he invariably held them till death.' And a friend of sixty years, who has just passed away, expressed the hope, a little before he died, that they should carry on their friendship in a better world.

"While the circle of his friendships was thus always preserved in its fulness and increasing in its extent, the nearer you got to the centre, the stronger became the power. 'The value of his character,' writes an old friend who sat side by side with him sixteen years in the House of Commons, 'can only be estimated by those who came in daily contact with him, and could see the true workings of a most kind, benevolent and large-hearted man.' The beautiful union of mutual affection which so long existed between the two brothers, and then again between the brother and the sister, and the reverential attachment of a numerous generation of surviving relatives, bear witness to his strong family affection; so that, without penetrating into the interior sanctities of private life, we yet do know that the public-spirited citizen, while honoured abroad, was both honoured and loved at home. And this we need not wonder at, if the foundation of the whole was, as we have said, 'the hidden man of the heart, in that which is not corruptible.'

"After a gradual decay, extending over eighteen months, during which the long confinement, to one of his active habits, must have been peculiarly trying, but which he bore without a word of impatience or complaint, except for the trouble which he thought he was causing to others, he passed away with scarcely a struggle, the oldest member of this congregation."

"Mark the perfect man, and behold the upright, for the end of that man is peace."

J. R.

---

#### THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND HER CREEDS.

THE Church of England has shovelled books and pamphlets by wholesale into the creed—the aggregate creed of her communion. It is hardly possible to over-estimate the difference between her practice and that of the primitive Church in this respect. The only creed that can be made out from the few approaches to one in the Epistles of the New Testament is about a third the length of the Apostles' Creed, and not so long as the Lord's Prayer. The creed of the Church of England, comprehending everything which a clergyman is required to declare his assent and consent to, is a course of sacred literature, written in various styles and for different purposes. The Roman Catholics have really not done so much as we have in this respect; for their Creed of Pope Pius is not, in bulk at least, a very considerable addition to the three old creeds of the Church.—*The Times*, May 28th.